FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 211

31 October 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

U.S. Response to Latest Soviet INF Proposals Viewed AA 1
Moratorium Violation 'Big Lie' AA 1
[IZVESTIYA 30 Oct]
'U.S. Propaganda Subterfuge' AA 2
[Bogachev]
'Uncompromising Position' Prevails AA 3
[Ponomarev]
Reagan Resorting to 'Slander' AA 4
U.S. Seen 'Marking Time' AA 5
[Grigoriyev]
Soviet Flexibility 'Has Limits' AA 5
[Doronin]
History of Euromissile Deployment Plans Depicted AA 7
[Rusakov, Kharlanov in PRAVDA 28 Oct]
Soviet Delegate Discusses MBFR 'Stagnation' AA 9

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Deputy Foreign Ministers Stress Asian Security BB 1
Warsaw Pact Military Council Meets in Lvov BB 2
Ustinov Receives Awards on 75th Birthday BB 2

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Kobysh, Shishlin, Levin]
'Reaction' to Andropov Statement CC 1
USSR 'Displaying Genuine Flexibility' CC 2
Grenada Shows U.S. 'Recklessness' CC 3
U.S. 'Threat' to Nicaragua CC 5
'Dead End' in Middle East CC 6
'Socialist States' Stress 'Unity' CC 7
'International Situation: Questions and Answers' CC 8
[Anikin, Katin, Zholkver]
Soviet 'Peace Offensive' CC 8
Antiwar Campaign 'Unprecedented' CC 9
U.S. Uses 'Gunboat Diplomacy' CC 10
Reagan Criticized in U.S. CC 11

U.S. Action on Grenada Criticized at UN CC 12
'U.S. Political Isolation' Viewed CC 12
U.S. Branded 'With Infamy' CC 13
[Chigir]
Criticism by Nonaligned Cited CC 14
[Kharkov]
TASS Statement at UN CC 15

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Commentary on Reagan's Grenada, Lebanon Speech A 1
President's Policy 'Illegal' A 1
[Dmitriyev]
Statement 'Palpably False' A 2
USSR Protests 'Bandit Attack' on Embassy in Grenada A 3
Shultz Has 'Unpleasant' Sessions With Allies A 4
[Ovchinnikov]
Casey 'Ignores' UN Charter, International Laws A 4
[Lyutiy]
Pentagon 'Preempting' Military Budget Debates A 5
[Agafonov in IZVESTIYA 25 Oct]
'Jeopardized' Space Shuttle Schedule Noted A 6
U.S. Exports 'Death, Slavery' Worldwide A 6
[Kornilov]

CHINA

PRC Trade Union Congress Session Reviewed B 1
Soviet-Chinese Consultations to Resume in March B 1
Third-Round Talks 'Frank' B 1
Ilichev Delegation Departs B 1

SOUTH ASIA

Moscow Warns of Grenada-Like RDF Action in Area D 1
'Obstacles' in Soviet-Pakistani Relations Viewed D 2
PRAVDA Hails India's International Role D 3
[Editorial, 22 Oct]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

SRV's Nguyen Co Thach on USSR Peace Initiatives E 1
[IZVESTIYA 27 Oct]
Aliyev Delegation Visits SRV, Attends Meetings E 3
Met By Pham Van Dong E 3
[PRAVDA 28 Oct]
Le Duan, Aliyev Meet E 3
'Warm, Friendly' Talks E 6
[IZVESTIYA 29 Oct]
Yepishev Receives Laos Army Delegation E 11
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Oct]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA


Lebanese President Leaves for Geneva Talks H 1
U.S. Policy, Reinforcements to Lebanon Scored H 1
'Reagan's Aggressive Plans' H 1
'Slander' Against Soviets H 1
[Timoshkin]
U.S. Policy 'Attempts To Divide Arabs' H 2
[Zlatorunskiy]
U.S. Presence in Indian Ocean, Persian Gulf Hit H 2
[Golts in KRASNAYA ZVEDA 21 Oct]
Muslim Delegation Ends Visit to Kuwait H 3
Egyptian Progressive Unionist Party CC Meets H 4
[Zlatoninskiy]


LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN


Grenada Exemplifies U.S. Policy of 'Aggression' K 1
[Falin in IZVESTIYA 28 Oct]
U.S. 'Banditry', 'Vandalism' in Grenada Assailed K 2
[Korionov in PRAVDA 28 Oct]
Cuban Statements, Comments on Grenada Noted K 4
[PRAVDA 28 Oct]
U.S. 'Allegations' Denied K 6
Castro Statements Cited K 7
U.S. Statements on Grenada Invasion Questioned K 7
Scoon Seen as U.S. 'Front Man' In Grenada K 8


NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS


Shcherbitskiy 21 October Kharkov Address R 1
[PRAVDA UKRAINY 22 Oct]
MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA Carries Grishin Addresses R 8
Veterans Council [7 Oct] R 8
Moscow Party Conference [13 Oct] R 10
Anniversary Planning Session [18 Oct] R 11
Shevardnadze Chairs Construction Group Meeting R 11
[ZARYA VOSTOKA 15 Oct]
Supreme Soviet Awards Lenin Order to Ustinov R 12
Weather Worsens at Site of Arctic Ship Rescue R 12
Last of 20 Vessels Rescued R 12
Moscow Reports Chemical Factory Accident R 12

U.S. RESPONSE TO LATEST SOVIET INF PROPOSALS VIEWED

Moratorium Violation 'Big Lie'

PM311049 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS Report: "Irresponsible Maneuvers by the White House"]

[Text] Washington 29 Oct -- The United States Department of State has issued a lengthy statement concerning the latest Soviet initiatives directed at a substantial reduction of nuclear arms in Europe while ensuring a full equality between Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries by number of medium-range missiles, medium-range nuclear-capable bombers and also the nuclear weapons carried by them. On having failed to find any arguments against the adoption of these bold and far-reaching proposals, Washington is trying to distort their meaning and replace an attentive study of these initiatives with pitiful idle talk about some "serious defects" in the USSR's position. Among these "defects" Washington lists the Soviet Union's legitimate demand that NATO and the USSR should have an equal number of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe.

What concerns the State Department most is not how to take the Geneva talks out of the impasse but how to get the new American missiles into the European Continent. Only this can explain the fact that in the Soviet Union's readiness to have in Europe about 140 SS-20 missile launchers, that is, noticeably less than the number of medium-range missile launchers in the possession of Britain and France, who are members of NATO, the State Department, resorting to obvious fraud and swindle, managed to detect a non-existent "admission by the Russians that there is no balance now."

But it is well known that an approximate equality of medium-range nuclear weapons exists in Europe for a number of years: The USSR has somewhat more delivery vehicles (938 against NATO's 857) while the North Atlantic alliance has an almost 50 percent advantage in the number of nuclear weapons carried by these systems.

Continuing to use the big lie, the U.S. State Department alleges that the Soviet Union is not observing the moratorium it proclaimed unilaterally some 18 months ago on the deployment of medium-range weapons in the European part of the USSR. The "data" furnished to support this claim is a total invention. The moratorium is being undeviating observed despite what the slanderers say. More than that, an end was put to the additional deployment of missiles also beyond the Urals, in areas from which they could reach West European countries.

Washington constantly speaks about the readiness of the United States to continue the talks in Geneva. But what talks are they referring to? The United States clearly wants such talks that would legalise the deployment of new American missiles in Europe. So the essence of the U.S. line remains unchanged: to secure substantial military superiority over the USSR.

But as it has been repeatedly stressed by the Soviet side, the purpose of the talks should be not the buildup of arms, not the deployment of new missiles, but the lowering of the military confrontation in Europe to a less dangerous level. The United States wants to turn this formula inside out. It must be absolutely clear, however, that the Soviet Union will not be a partner of the United States at talks that will lead to the growth of the already hugh nuclear arsenals in Europe and give its blessing to the military superiority of the United States and its NATO allies.

The most responsible period is setting in. Where will the talks lead to, what path will they follow, will they provide a possibility of reaching accord or will a new dangerous spiral of the arms race being? Washington continues to opt for the dangerous path. It rejects constructive approaches and demonstrates unwillingness to reach accord. And no false words about the "flexibility" of the United States can conceal this obvious fact.

U.S. 'Propaganda Subterfuge'

LD290000 Moscow TASS in English 2330 GMT 28 Oct 83

["U.S. State Department's Fresh Falsification" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow October 28 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

While categorically rejecting the Soviet proposals on a considerable cut in the nuclear weapons in Europe and on establishing full equality between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO member states as regards the number of aircraft, medium-range missiles and nuclear warheads in them, Washington is having recourse to cheap propaganda subterfuges directed at distracting the attention of the world public from its obstructionist stand at the Geneva talks.

The U.S. State Department has issued a statement touching, in particular, upon the question of the Soviet Union's readiness to have in Europe roughly 140 launchers of the "SS-20" missiles, that is appreciably less than the NATO member countries, Britain and France, have together.

In this case Washington did not even make an attempt at evaluating in some way or other the fresh Soviet initiative directed at reaching mutually acceptable decisions in Geneva. The U.S. State Department visualised in the Soviet proposals only, what it described as admission by the Russians that there is no equilibrium at the present time.

This is a crude distortion of the facts.

It is well known that for a number of years now a rough parity has remained in the field of medium-range nuclear weapons. At the present time NATO has in that region 857, and the USSR -- 938 medium-range delivery vehicles. The USSR has more land-based missiles -- 455 as against 18 of NATO. But the North Atlantic bloc has almost a fifty per cent superiority as regards the number of medium-range nuclear-capable bombers (695 against 465 possessed by the USSR). The Soviet Union has 18 SLBM's in the coastal waters of Europe as against 144 French and British sea-based missiles.

NATO has also an almost fifty percent superiority by the most important indicator -- the nuclear warheads in the medium-range weapons in Europe: 3,056 as against 2,153 warheads, which more than compensates some advantage of the USSR as regards the total number of delivery vehicles.

The absurd conclusions of the U.S. State Department as regards the essence of the latest Soviet peace initiatives will not mislead anybody. Its statement is only evidence of the fact that Washington does not wish, as before, to show goodwill for ensuring progress as the Geneva talks and is guided by the striving to deploy new American missiles in Western Europe, whatever the cost.

'Uncompromising Position' Prevails

LD290100 Moscow TASS in English 0006 GMT 29 Oct 83

["There Still is Time" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow October 28 TASS -- TASS commentator Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The United States and its NATO allies continue to hold what amounts to an uncompromising position on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. At the meeting of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group, held in Ottawa on October 27 and 28 on the level of defense ministers, its members stated again that nothing could stop the deployment of American cruise missiles with a long range and Pershing-2 ballistic missiles in Britain, Italy and the FRG at the end of this year. According to the Pentagon's plans, as it is reported by the British press, these nuclear missiles are to be ready for combat use already by December 15!

Neither in Washington nor in the other capitals of NATO countries do they want to explain, and hardly can do this convincingly, the reason of the rush in deploying first-strike nuclear weapons, and the Pershings and the cruises are precisely such weapons, in direct proximity of the territory of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community.

It is well known that the USSR, the sole country of the socialist community with a nuclear potential, does not have medium-range nuclear weapons capable of reaching the territory of the United States. As to the United States, it has such weapons reaching the territory of the USSR among the front-based weapons in Europe, including 400 submarine-launched "Poseidon" warheads at the disposal of the NATO Supreme Command. Britain and France, that belong to the NATO bloc, also have such nuclear weapons.

If we are to proceed from the principle of equality and equal security of the sides it becomes obvious that the Reagan administration has no reason at all to move its latest nuclear weapons closer to the territory of the Soviet Union, using the West European states in the process as a shield against a possible Soviet nuclear retaliation.

The Reagan administration and those governments of NATO countries that are following in the wake of United States policy arrogantly ignore the large-scale popular actions against the deployment of American nuclear weapons in Western Europe and remain deaf to the USSR's proposals on limiting nuclear arms in Europe.

Why are they acting in such a manner? The Reagan administration, and this is not concealed in Washington, wants to achieve military superiority over socialist countries at all costs. This would create a direct danger to the security and life of our peoples. Washington uses as a screen the demagogic statements about some sort of flexibility shown by the United States at the Geneva talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe while in reality the United States leaders are doing everything to avoid reaching an agreement with the Soviet Union on a just and equal basis.

The United States still has time to revise its unreasonable policy in respect of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. If we start with the main thing -- new American nuclear missiles should not be deployed in Europe because this would tilt the entire military strategic situation in the continent in NATO's favour -- then within the framework of the USSR's flexible and constructive position there exists a real possibility of achieving a mutually acceptable accord and substantially defusing the situation in the European zone.

Reagan Resorting to 'Slander'

LD301535 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1310 GMT 30 Oct 83

[Text] Washington, 30 Oct (TASS) -- Not having any arguments against adopting the constructive new Soviet initiatives aimed at a considerable reduction of nuclear arms in Europe, Washington has been forced to twist and turn, to resort to cheap propaganda maneuvers and open lies in order to justify its aggressive plans for deployment of all costs of the new generation of U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe.

This was vividly demonstrated by President Reagan's latest radio address to the country. In it he vaguely promised that the United States "will study these proposals at the Geneva talks." However, he then made it understood that they are plainly not to Washington's liking since they "do not allow NATO to deploy its medium-range missiles" in Western Europe.

Here he intentionally remained quiet about such an important clause of the Soviet initiatives as the Soviet Union's readiness to have approximately 140 SS-20 launch installations in Europe, that is, notably fewer than the medium-range missile launch installations that Britain and France -- members of the North Atlantic bloc -- have. Reagan has not found anything better to justify his blatantly obstructionist approach to the Geneva talks than to resort again to slanderous attacks on the Soviet Union. Crudely distorting the facts, he has tried to present the case as if it were the USSR, and not the United States, drawing up monstrous doctrines of "limited" and "protracted" nuclear wars, that is threatening peace, as if it were the USSR, and not the United States, embarking on a gigantic program of "strategic rearmament," that is the initiator of new spirals in the arms race.

Portraying white as black, Reagan at the same time raised by all means possible the NATO Nuclear Group decision to withdraw from the armory obsolete operational-tactical nuclear ammunition, which the United States has on the territory of the West European countries, as "a gigantic step on the road to strengthening stability in Europe and the world."

That is truly a big lie, which knows no limits! After all, the master of the White House knows very well that this imaginary "reduction" of NATO's nuclear arsenals is nothing but a shameless deception intended to mislead international public opinion. In actual fact this is not a reduction of NATO's nuclear arsenals but a qualitative renewal and further build-up of them. The obsolete nuclear weapons and ammunition will be replaced by more modern and effectives ones. It is well known that by 1990 the Pentagon plans to produce 17,000 new units of nuclear ammunition. Of these, 7,000 will be earmarked exclusively for deployment in Europe in place of about 1,000 obsolete nuclear artillery shells and about 300 atomic mines of the old type which are being "reduced." In their place, the NATO arsenals in Europe are to be filled with new nuclear warheads for Pershings and cruise missiles, and by new and more powerful air bombs.

"We are striving for peace and security," "We are striving to conclude as soon as possible a just and verifiably agreement" at Geneva, the head of the Washington administration hypocritically assures us. The facts and the actions taken by Washington, however, indicate directly the reverse. They indicate that the United States is striving at all costs to upset, in its favor, the rough equality of forces that has developed in Europe and the world, and that it is prepared to bring the world to the brink of a nuclear catastrophe so long as it can achieve military superiority.

## U.S Seen 'Marking Time'

LD200402 Moscow in English to North American 2300 GMT 29 Oct 83

[Text] We follow with a commentary by our military observer, Colonel Eduard Grigoriyev, and this is what he writes:

In the present extremely dangerous situation arising from the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe scheduled for the end of the year, the Soviet Union continues to advance new proposals for reaching a mutually acceptable agreement on nuclear arms limitation in Europe.

In his interview with the newspaper PRAVDA, the Soviet leader, Yuriy Andropov, advanced to a series of constructive proposals aimed at reaching a solution to the problem on the basis of equality and equal security. If the United States abandoned its plans to deploy its missiles in Europe by the day announced, the Soviet Union could already now begin reducing its SS-4 missiles, of which it holds more than 200, and complete the dismantling of these missiles in 1984-85. If an agreement is reached in Geneva, the Soviet Union would scrap a considerable part of the present SS-20 missiles. The stumbling block therefore is the stand of the American side which is bent on deploying its Pershing II and cruise missiles in West Germany, Britain, Italy, Belguim, and Holland at all costs toward the end of the year. In fact the Reagan administration is abandoning the search for agreement; it flatly rejects all Soviet initiatives and marks time at the talks so that it can go ahead with the deployment of the missiles in December on the grounds that the Geneva talks failed.

Large-scale preparations for installing the missiles are already underway at the military bases in West Germany, Britain, and Italy. In the circumstances, the Soviet Union cannot afford to unilaterally reduce its missiles. In his interview with the PRAVDA Yuriy Andropov made this point. He underlined that the Soviet Union will not put at risk its own security or the security of its allies. Faced with this situation the Soviet Union has to take and is already taking appropriate additonal measures to strengthen its defenses. Since preparations have been stepped up in Western Europe for the deployment of new American nuclear missiles to be trained on the Soviet Union and their Warsaw Treaty countries, preparations are underway in the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia for the deployment of tactical missiles. This has been announced by the Soviet Defense Ministry and the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia.

These are forced measures undertaken in response. There would have been no need for them if the United States abandoned its plan to deploy Pershings and cruise missiles in Europe. The measures undertaken by the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, and Czechoslovakia concern Europe and they were dictated by the need to counterbalance the NATO forces in the European region. Since the deployment of the new American missiles would upset the balance of strength on a global scale, the Soviet Union will also have to take measures in response with regard to American territory. There should be no doubt at all that the Soviet Union will take these measures if the deployment of new American missiles in Europe does go ahead.

## Soviet Flexibility 'Has Limits'

LD281140 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] You are already acquainted with Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's replies to the questions of a PRAVDA correspondent in connection with the situation at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear arms limitation in Europe, which are being held in Geneva.

The Soviet Union's new proposals, contained in the replies which are designed to make it easier to find a way out of the deadlock caused by the United States at the talks, have been received with great attention abroad. Here is our commentator Anatoliy Doronin:

Two opposing lines can be clearly traced in the foreign reaction to the new proposals contained in Comrade Andropov's replies. On the one hand there is acceptance of their importance and a high appraisal of the Soviet Union's flexibility, which has been demonstrated by the fact that, for the sake of easing tension and eliminating the nuclear danger, the Soviet Union is prepared to make certain concessions to the United States. On the other there is categorical rejection of the new Soviet proposals, just like the previous ones.

What is this all about? It is clear to every unprejudiced person that the measures proposed by our country previously during the Geneva talks on a substantial reduction in medium-range nuclear means up to the complete liquidation in Europe of nuclear weapons, both tactical and medium-range, are a good basis for constructive talks. As Comrade Andropov noted, they contain all the necessary elements for a mutually-acceptable understanding that does not infringe upon anyone's interests, either the USSR and its allies, the United States or the West European states.

The new additional steps Comrade Andropov announced -- the USSR's readiness to have fewer medium-range missile launchers in Europe than Britain and France, given equality in warheads; the statement that Soviet missiles will not be moved from east to west, in the event, of course, of an understanding being reached at Geneva; and the readiness to establish equal levels of medium-range aircraft capable of carrying nuclear weapons in mutually-acceptable numbers -- all this makes it much easier to achieve an understanding. Millions of people in Western Europe and the United States realize this, as is shown by the positive reaction to the Soviet proposals and the unprecedented scale of the anti-missile and anti-nuclear movement in these countries.

If the United States shows a true desire to achieve a successful conclusion to the talks, a way out of the Geneva deadlock can be found. But the U.S. Government immediately, without pausing to think, rejected the Soviet proposals, without even resorting to the previous standard response -- that the proposals will be studied.

Washington is stubbornly moving toward the deployment of its Pershing and cruise missiles in Western Europe, aiming to please the most reactionary forces, who not only stand to gain by the production of mass destruction weapons, but who would like, with the aid of these weapons, to destroy socialism, halt the world revolutionary process, and rebuild the world in the American style.

But no one has the right to turn back the progress of history. As noted in Comrade Andropov's statement, in the 65 years of its existence, the Soviet state has successfully passed many severe tests. Those who have attacked our state's integrity, independence, and our system have ended up on the ash heap of history. They should remember this in Washington. The Soviet Union has one again made an effort to wrest the Geneva talks from deadlock. Once again it has shown flexibility and good will. But there is a limit to any flexibility, and goodwill is not a sign of weakness. The present U.S. Administration ought to know this, just as it ought to know that the Soviet Union will be able to give a fitting reply to any attempt to upset the existing military strategic balance. Its word cannot be separated from its deeds.

HISTORY OF EUROMISSILE DEPLOYMENT PLANS DEPICTED

PM310858 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Oct 83 First Edition p 4

[Article by Ye. Rusakov and Yu. Kharlanov: "History of a Deception"]

[Text] As yet West Europeans can see the tiger-striped silhouettes of the Pershing-II missiles striking their predatory pose and the cruise missiles' blunt-nosed fuselages, reminiscent of sharks' heads, only on the television screens. But in the very near future, according to Pentagon plans, the inhabitants of at least three countries -- the FRG, Britain, and Italy -- are to be acquainted with them at first hand.

Meanwhile Washington and NATO propaganda is continuing to allege, as though there were nothing to it, that the deployment of the U.S. first-strike weapons in Europe is in response to the modernization of Soviet medium-range missiles. They are persistently dating the history of the "new generation" of U.S. medium-range missiles back to 1977.

Is that the case?

The first blueprints for the Pershing-II and cruise missiles were on the U.S. military corporation design bureaus' drawing boards many years earlier. The cruise missiles at the very beginning of the seventies and the Pershing-II missiles in 1969. And in 1974 the then U.S. Defense Secretary J. Schlesinger had already demanded that Congress earmark additional funds especially for these purposes. These funds were included in the Pentagon budget for fiscal 1975 when the USSR did not have the SS-20 missiles.

The Pentagon "scenarios" for using medium-range missiles in Europe appeared even earlier than the blueprints. Let's begin with the fact that, as former U.S. Defense Secretary R. McNamara has recalled, "the use of nuclear weapons has been an inalienable part of NATO military strategy since the alliance was born.... By late 1953 the deployment of a considerable quantity of tactical nuclear weapons -- artillery shells, bombs, short-range missiles, atomic mines, and so forth -- had begun in Europe." In December 1954 a NATO Council session officially approved the strategic nuclear weapons (not to mention tactical ones) in the event of a war in Europe. This strategy was in operation through 1967, after which NATO shifted to the "flexible response" strategy based on the premise that a war could be "limited" to the use of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe.

At the NATO Council December 1975 session Washington foisted on its European partners the deployment of the medium-range Thor and Jupiter missiles in Europe. In 1961, referring to the Thor and Jupiter missiles, H. Schmidt, subsequently FRG chancellor, wrote: "Anyone who thinks objectively must agree that the deployment of medium-range enemy missiles on the very threshold of someone else's house, so to speak, must psychologically, be interpreted by a great power as an act of provocation.... The U.S. medium-range missiles are suitable solely for a surprise or preemptive strike, not a retaliatory one."

Having created the "triad" -- a selection of ground-launched, sea-launched, and air-launched strategic nuclear weapons -- in the early sixties, Washington considered that the medium-range missiles of that time were not effective enough.

"After 1963, when the United States deliberately moved its Thor and Jupiter missiles from the continent, NATO did not set about deploying any medium-range missiles," Tom Wicker recalls in THE NEW YORK TIMES. "NATO relied on the ICBM's deployed in North America, on the missile-carrying submarines in European waters, on a whole series of aircraft capable of dropping nuclear weapons on the Soviet Union from West Europe, and on the French and British nuclear forces." There are no plans for dismantling or withdrawing from Europe and adjacent waters a single one of the types of medium-range weapons which NATO has set up against the Soviet missiles since 1963, T. Wicker notes.

But the "triad" of existing U.S. forward-based weapons and the British and French nuclear weapons were not enough for the Pentagon. Back in the late sixties Washington strategists again turned their gaze toward medium-range missiles which, because of their increased accuracy, speed, and other parameters, fitted in well with the Pentagon's scenarios for nuclear aggression. In his book "White House Years" former U.S. Secretary of State H. Kissinger admitted that the anti-Soviet and anti-Cuban campaign mounted back in 1970 over the Soviet submarine base allegedly built in Cuba was designed to obtain, as a "responsive measure," substantial superiority over the USSR by deploying U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Turkey to "compensate." However, this plan did not succeed at the time.

The plans to achieve U.S. and NATO military superiority in Europe and throughout the world by deploying medium-range missiles in West Europe finally matured in Washington by the mid-seventies. The no 10 survey-memorandum prepared in the summer of 1977 by the U.S. National Security Council to "amend" the approximate military equilibrium actually existing in Europe suggested various prescriptions for action, including the accelerated buildup of NATO's conventional forces. But in its "amendment" of the situation the Pentagon gambled mainly on the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in West Europe and on a surprise nuclear strike against Soviet strategic weapons and command centers, known in the Pentagon script-writers' vocabulary as a "limited" war.

"Although the U.S. strategic forces could reach any hypothetical target inside the USSR, Washington would like to counter Soviet weapons without having recourse to its own strategic arsenal," NEWSWEEK wrote. "The administration thus wants to modernize the NATO nuclear forces, deploying two new arms systems in West Europe."

But how to persuade the West European countries of the "need" to turn them into a bridgehead for U.S. weapons of mass annihilation? So Washington decided to link its long-matured plans for disrupting nuclear equilibrium with the Soviet SS-20 missiles. As of 1977 this linkage began to serve as propaganda cover.

In December 1979, under flagrant pressure from Washington, the NATO Council session in Brussels adopted the "two-track decision" which hinged on a statement on the deployment of 572 new U.S. missiles in Europe. At the same time it was stated that "the NATO alliance's common interests will be best served by steering two parallel and complementary courses toward modernizing tactical nuclear weapons and arms control." As the West German newspaper WESTFALISCHE RUNDSCHAU recently mentioned, "It is frequently forgotten that NATO did not take the decision to deploy weapons in any circumstances. On the contrary, it was decided to discuss in December 1983 whether this deployment was necessary and, if it was, in what form." At the same time statesmen in West European countries justified the adoption of the NATO "two-track decision" by asserting that without it the U.S. Senate would not approve the SALT II treaty and the military detente process supplementing political detente would be thwarted.

However, the United States broke its promise to its allies -- SALT II was not ratified. It also emerged very soon that of the two parts of the 1979 NATO decision Washington intended only to fulfill the first -- on the deployment of new missiles.

When the new U.S. Administration took office, Washington steered a course frankly aimed at achieving military, and primarily nuclear, missile superiority and at hiking the arms race. In his first speech as U.S. President on 20 January 1981, R. Reagan stated that one of his administration's main tasks was "to achieve peace through strength." On instructions from the White House the Pentagon drafted the "Directives in the Field of Defense for 1984 through 1988," which were approved in the spring of 1982. They were based on the development of plans for nuclear conflict. The document preaches the concepts of a "limited" or "protracted" nuclear war and the possibility of a U.S. "victory" in it. The plans for delivering a first nuclear strike against the USSR and its allies assign a special place to the Pershing II and cruise missiles. The "directives" directly set as the priority task the building up of nuclear forces and the development and supply of these missiles.

"Unfortunately European public opinion is not being told that these few hundred new missiles change everything," the French magazine LE NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR wrote. "This is a decisive turning point, the start of a new military technology race, the choice of a particular future for Europe. It is no accident that the Americans...have again become inflexible on the question of these missiles' deployment in Europe. The point is that in a few months in 1980 the United States changed violently. The new administration proclaimed as its own an idea which had slowly been maturing under the two previous administrations -- the idea of a limited nuclear war which could be won. For Reagan and Pentagon chief Weinberger, whose line of conduct is confrontation with the USSR everywhere and in everything, war in Europe became one hypothesis among others."

In November 1981, having finally agreed to talks with the USSR, the present U.S. Administration put forward a proposal for the USSR's unilateral disarmament. As though in jest, it was given the name "zero option."

When the unsoundness of Reagan's "zero decision" became absolutely obvious, in March 1983 Washington put forward the so-called "interim solution" and, quite recently a "new" version of this solution. All these versions come down to the proposal to agree on how many medium-range Soviet missiles are to be reduced and how many new U.S. missiles are to be deployed in Europe in addition to the nuclear potential NATO already has.

"On verification, it turns out that U.S. flexibility goes no further than words. The thrust of the U.S. line remains the same, securing a considerable military superiority over the USSR through the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Europe," Yu. V. Andropov noted in his replies to PRAVDA's questions.

The Reagan administration's position is the same deception with which Washington and NATO have tried from the outset to conceal their dangerous nuclear-missile undertaking in Europe.

SOVIET DELEGATE DISCUSSES MBFR 'STAGNATION'

LD282212 Moscow TASS in English 2129 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Vienna October 28 TASS -- The main cause of stagnation at the talks here on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe is the absence on the part of the West of a desire to reach agreement on an equal and mutually acceptable basis on the lowering of the dangerous level of military confrontation in the center of the European Continent.

This was stressed by the leader of the Soviet delegation Valerian Mikhaylov at a press conference held today in connection with the decade of the Vienna talks. This is evidenced, he said, by the drawn out discussion on the number of troops each side has in the agreed-upon area, engineered by the West with the aim of securing asymmetrical reductions suitable to it, by its refusal to reduce both troops and armaments, and by many other examples.

Considering the pressing need to move the talks off dead centre, especially in the present international situation that has deteriorated as a result of Washington's irresponsible actions, the socialist countries came out with a new important initiative on June 23 of this year in which they make steps to meet the West halfway. They presented a draft of an all-embracing agreement providing for the obligation of the sides to reduce their ground forces in central Europe in the course of three years from the moment of the entry of the agreement into force so that in the end the total size of personnel of each side would be reduced to equal collective levels of 900,000 each, including ground forces of 700,000 each, while limiting the air force personnel of each side to 200,000 men. The draft contains a detailed section on measures of monitoring the fulfilment of obligations stemming from the agreement.

Besides, seeking to facilitate the attainment of the talks' ultimate goal -- the reduction of their armed forces by both sides to equal aggragate levels, said Valerian Mikhaylov, the socialist countries proposed that the Soviet Union and the United States remove part of their troops from central Europe by mutual example. One advantage of this proposal is that it could be implemented without any specail agreements, that is without the hammering out of many difficult questions. This would create a more favourable atmosphere for further talks on bigger reductions.

Thus, an unbiased observer can see that the Warsaw Treaty countries have exerted many efforts to achieve progress at the Vienna talks. Their tabled draft of a comprehensive agreement together with their proposals of February 17, 1983, can serve as a clear-cut, realistic program of practical action to get the Vienna talks out of the impasse at long last.

The socialist countries have done everything possible to bring the positions of the sides closer together and achieve mutually acceptable solutions, the head of the Soviet delegation said further. They are entitled to expecting businesslike and constructive response from the West. Sadly, there has been no such response so far.

More than eight months have already passed since our proposals were submitted in February and four months after the socialist countries submitted a comprehensive draft agreement, but we so far do not know the stand of the West on the whole package of the important issues envisaged in the proposals of the socialist countries. Contrary to their own declarative calls for a "constructive dialogue," the Western participants in the talks continue firmly adhering to their old unrealistic and biased positions, which do not provide an end to the deadlock.

Moreover, they are intensively unfolding the arms race in order to ensure military advantage for NATO. A most striking example of that, the head of the Soviet delegation stressed, is the planned deployment in the territory of the Western countries-participants in the Vienna talks of new American medium-range nuclear missile systems.

It shall be clear that such actions not only further complicate the international situation, but also worsen prospects of the Vienna talks. There is an impression that the West is taking part in them only in order to sow illusions and lull public vigilance for continuing the arms race. The socialist countries maintain that it is necessary, before it is too late to go over to realistic stands and display in practice political will to reaching agreements on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security.

DEPUTY FOREIGN MINISTERS STRESS ASIAN SECURITY

LD282219 Moscow TASS in English 2021 GMT Oct 83

[Text] Ulaanbaatar October 28 TASS -- The present period is characterised by a sharp aggravation of the international situation caused by attempts by the more aggressive circles led by the United States to check the world's onward development. These circles see wrecking the strategic military balance and gaining military superiority over socialist countries as the main means of achieving their adventuristic aims. This is said in a report on a consultative working meeting of deputy foreign ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the German Democratic Republic, the People's Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the USSR and Czechoslovakia, which was held in Ulanbaatar on October 26 and 27. A thorough exchange of opinions took palce during the meeting on a number of pressing questions related to the situation in Asia, with special attention paid to the tasks of ensuring peace and security in this continent.

The report said that reactionary cirlces are escalating acts of subversion and mounting hysterical psychological war against real socialist and the forces of national and social liberation. Seats of crises are erupting and being preserved in various areas across Asia and Africa as well as Central America and the Caribbean, where the United States is perpetrating direct armed interference.

Imperialist, expansionist and other forces hostile to the cause of peace and the national independence and social progress of the peoples, the report said, are stepping up their intrigues in Asia. Washington is busily enlisting both its NATO partners and its Asian allies, first of all Japan, in its military and political streategy in relation to the Asian Continent, and attempts are being made to form a broad front directed against socialist countries.

The situation in Asia is being especially exacerbated by the actions of the United States to make parts of Asia and the Indian and Pacific Oceans into targets of acts of intervention by the "Rapid Deployment Force", into a bridgehead for nuclear war. The meeting stressed the profoundly principled and long-term significance of the Prague Political Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty member states, the joint statement of the party and state leaders of socialist countries adopted at a a meeting a Moscow, Yuriy Andropov's statement of September 28, and the constructive initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries towards curbing the arms race, averting nuclear war and improving the political climate in the world, in particular Asia.

The Soviet initiatives directed at limiting nuclear systems in Asia as well as naval activities there are extremely important. The USSR's proposal for holding talks on confidence-building measures in the Far East is assuming growing practical significance.

The meeting emphasised the urgent and important nature of the initiatives of Mongolia, the Indochinese countries, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Domocratic Republic of Afghanistan and other peace-loving Asian states. Full support was expressed in this connection to the peace proposals of the Indochinese countries aiming to promote dialogue with the ASEAN states and settle contentious issues between them at the negotiating table.

Immutable solidarity was reaffirmed with the struggle of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea to defend their independence and sovereignty. It was pointed out that the vigorous peace efforts of India, the largest non-aligned state, are having positive influence on the situation in Asia.

The participants in the meeting declared readiness to study carefully all positive initiatives and discuss them constructively with a view to working out measures to prevent the further deterioration of the situation in Asia and strengthen mutual trust and security among Asian states.

The participants in the meeting voiced the shared conviction of their countries that the implementation of practical measures to enhance peace and security in Asia, to settle conflicts and remove the seats of military tension fanned by imperialist and other forces would meet the interests of all Asian states.

WARSAW PACT MILITARY COUNCIL MEETS IN LVOV

LD291719 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 29 Oct 83

[Text] A regular session of the Military Council of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact states was held in Lvov in the USSR under the chairmanship of Marshal of the Soviet Union Kulikov, commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces, from 26 to 29 October.

Taking part in the work of the Military Council were members of the Military Council and the delegations of the Bulgarian People's Army, the Hungarian People's Army, the GDR National People's Army, the Polish People's Army, the Army of the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Armed Forces of the USSR, and the Czechoslovak People's Army, which they headed.

The Military Council discussed certain issues of the current activities of the Joint Armed Forces, and adopted corresponding recommendations for further improvement of combat readiness and field training.

The session took place in a businesslike atmosphere, in the spirit of friendship and mutual understanding.

That was a report on the results of the session of the Military Council of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact member states.

USTINOV RECEIVES AWARDS ON 75TH BIRTHDAY

LD302024 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 30 Oct 83

[Text] Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Hungary, and Mongolia have conferred lofty government awards upon Marshal of the Soviet Union Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense. The awards mark his outstanding contribution to the defense of peace and socialism and to the deepening of friendship and combat fraternity between the peoples, parties, and armed forces of the USSR and other socialist countries, and also in connection with his 75th birthday.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD302044 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 30 Oct 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program with political observers Vitaliy Ivanovich Kobysh and Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin and All-Union Radio commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin]

'Reaction' to Andropov Statement

[Text] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrade radio-listeners. This week's international events have been both very full and, if one takes into account, the events linked with the crude intervention of the United States in Grenada, to a considerable extent they have been dramatic. Under these conditions, in which the international situation has become more complex, the Soviet Union is continuing, precisely and consistently, to implement a course toward strengthening peace. Clear and convincing confirmation of the continuation of the development of this course were the replies of Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov to questions from PRAVDA. New and very important peace initiatives by the Soviet Union are set out in these replies. They have attracted widespread attention from the international public. We want first of all to draw your attention to this point, to the reaction of the international public.

[Shishlin] I would add, Viktor Nikolayevich, that the essence is, of course, in the substance of the Soviet initiatives themselves, but it is also in the assessment of the moment, which is contained in the replies of Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov -- one must, first of all, determine where we are. That was the first reply. The second dealt with what has to be done. Of course the answers were sound ones, to both questions. We are in a dangerous period of the development of international relations. Tension is not getting any less. On the other hand the possibility does exist -- and unfortunately this part of the replies is still being commented upon in a fairly vague way in the West -- the possibility does still exist, the head of the Soviet state stresses, of reaching a mutually acceptable solution at the Geneva talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe, based on the principle of equality and equal security, aimed at a considerable reduction in the levels of nuclear confrontation in Europe. There is another thing I would like to note in speaking about these reactions. They are fairly mixed. While our socialist friends and allies share the point of view of the Soviet Union -- and that is quite logical, since we implement a coordinated foreign policy -- and while the broad circles of the public welcome the new Soviet initiatives designed to end the impasse at the Geneva talks; in the West, in those circles directly involved in NATO's so-called two-track decision, the accent is being placed on one thesis -- to be precise, the fact that the Geneva talks will lose their point if U.S. nuclear missile weapons are deployed in Europe.

[Levin] We favor an accord. But we favor businesslike talks, and attempts to use these talks to deceive public opinion, which, in fact, is what the Americans are counting on.

[Kobysh] It seems to me that what you are saying, Viktor Nikolayevich, and what you have said, Nikolay Vladimirovich, has a great deal of substance. The reactions, given the whole acute nature of the situation, do focus upon the main thing, the fact that the head of the Soviet state, at this acute, even critical moment -- especially for the peoples of Europe -- has made some new, absolutely constructive and realistic proposals. This has received a very great response.

Although the bourgeois press organs have not yet spoken theirminds completely, I am confident that in government offices all these proposals are being carefully studied, both in Washington and in the countries of Western Europe. French television has broadcast that the main purport of what Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov has said lies in reminding the United States that it is not the sole master of the world. We now want the peoples to live in peace; we want the nuclear threat to be removed from the peoples, and herein lies the significance of the replies given by Yuriy Vladimirovich.

[Levin] But attention has been drawn to the fact that, in Washington, in my view, they did not have time to read Comrade Andropov's replies seriously before they hastened to state that they, allegedly, were not acceptable for them. The West German Government -- if one is to judge by the statement of its official spokesman -- admitted that there are constructive points in what Comrade Andropov has said, but that there are, at the same time, positions that are completely unacceptable to the West, it repeats. Whereas in Washington they were acting with the straightforwardness of the loud-mouth soldier, it seems to me that in Bonn they decided to embellish this straightforwardness with a pretty bow; to embellish it, but in essence not to change their position.

This reminds us once again of the fact that we are facing an extraordinarily complicated situation. I would recall, comrades, the essence of the new initiatives of the Soviet Union, which are set out in the replies of Comrade Andropov. There are three of them. First is the willingness of the Soviet Union, with due consideration for equality in warheads, to go so far as to accept a smaller number of medium-range missile delivery vehicles than those currently in the possession of Britain and France. Comrade Andropov names the figure -- approximately 140 -- and it is known that Britain and France have 162 of these units. The second very important point is the reply to the fears that have been voiced by the West that we are allegedly willing to reduce in the west but it is always possible for us to bring them in later from the east. Comrade Andropov says no, we will not transfer any from the east. Moreover -- and in my view it is worth giving particular attention to this point -- in the event that a Geneva agreement takes effect, if one is worked out, we will not deploy new SS-20 missiles in the eastern part of the Soviet Union. Finally, the third point is the willingness of the Soviet Union to fix equal ceilings for the total number of medium-range delivery aircraft for the USSR and NATO within a mutually-acceptable quantitative range. That is to say, we are displaying a sincere desire for an accord.

## USSR 'Displaying Genuine Flexibility'

[Kobysh] And to this I would like to add a very important phrase which is contained in this reply by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, let this be within a range which is substantially different from the one that has earlier been proposed by us, that is to say, we are ready to move our position a little, as they sometimes say, we are displaying genuine flexibility. We are ready for compromises for the sake of achieving the main thing.

[Shishlin] The main thing is that there are two sides: The first is that these proposals of course contain no element of playing the loser's game -- and here our listeners must understand this clearly; we are indeed in favor of maintaining the equilibrium, of maintaining the strategic parity of Europe, but at a lower level than today. And the second point: It is not the Soviet Union that is slamming the door at the Geneva talks. The Soviet Union is striving to keep this door open as long as this is possible, that is to say, as long as a businesslike discussion is being conducted and as long as Pershing and cruise missiles are not aimed against us.

[Levin] That is to say, we are willing to hold talks just as long as the subject of the talks -- specifically the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe -- has not been destroyed. But if NATO embarks upon the path of deploying the new missiles, then a completely different political situation arises, and under those conditions, without doubt, the continuation of the talks loses all sense.

[Kobysh] They would then be serving as cover for the active deployment, so to speak of these missiles.

[Levin] Of course. And they would reassure the public.

[Kobysh] Appearances would be created that an understanding about something was being reached, and at that time they would be deploying missiles.

[Levin] And indeed the constructive nature of our position is stressed by our recent proposal that the timescale which had been earlier fixed by NATO should be moved back and that genuinely constructive talks should be continued in Geneva.

[Shishlin] Of course, They must be continued for as long as is needed to work out a mutually acceptable compromise. And we are in favor of the creation of a favorable atmosphere at these talks, that is to say, we consider that a favorable atmosphere of this kind is coming into being as a result of the fact that we have already eliminated to a considerable extent part of our launch installations, the ones concerning the SS-5 missiles, and we are ready to eliminate during the course of 1984 and 1985 the launch installations of the SS-4 missiles, and, as Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov says, we have a fairly considerable number of these, more than 200. That is to say, our logic is as follows: The fewer weapons there are, the more energetic will be the unilateral steps aimed at disarmament and the more favorable will be the climate in Geneva for reaching mutually acceptable decisions. The Americans' logic is absurd: They consider that if they deploy their missiles and furthermore build up the number of these missiles on the territory of Western Europe, that then the climate will be favorable for reaching a mutually acceptable solution.

[Kobysh] That is, talks under the sights of the Pershing and cruise missiles.

## Grenada Shows U.S. 'Recklessness'

[Levin] But that is diktat, diktat against the Soviet Union, pressure through force: Of course, the Americans are very fond of pressure through force. This week's events have shown that they resort to it with a recklessness which simply knows no bounds. Evidence of this has been provided very clearly by this crude and cynical invasion of Grenada by U.S. troops, this small island, whose only fault -- fault from the U.S. politicians' point of view -- amounts to the fact that the island's population wanted to proceed along its own path of development and has established a social system which was not to the Americans' liking. Immense forces were thrown in. According to the latest figures, the Americans have sent there -- to start with there were 1,900 servicemen, mainly Marines, and subsequently a further 800 paratroops.

[Kobysh] From the 82d Airborne Division.

[Levin] Yes, from the 82d Airborne Division: And so the total is already brought to 2,700. Then there are 300 men from different countries in the Caribbean Basin, a police force, so to speak, which does not take part actively in military operations: Basically this is all being done...

[Kobysh -- interrupting] As a cover.

[Levin] As a cover, yes. It is a propaganda cover. But it is a scandalous action. The Americans have thrown in ships; and at the very time that this was taking place the nuclear submarine "Jackson" paid a goodwill visit to Bermuda waters -- what a wording to choose, it is a mockery of common sense. But the whole of the U.S. policy toward Grenada indicates a crying recklessness, an irresponsibility, and the TASS statement with total justification described this action as a crime gainst peace and against mankind.

[Shishlin] It should be recognized, Viktor Nikolayevich, that they are firing on Grenada but they are aiming at Nicaragua, Cuba and Central America, at this whole region.

[Kobysh] This is an act of aggression against all the peoples of the Caribbean, and in the whole of Latin America.

[Shishlin] Of course.

[Kobysh] In essence, this is a blow against all developing states. This is a warning to them saying, as it were, see what we can do, see what kind of people we are. And indeed this is how it was taken. The UN Security Council is currently in session, and in the UN lobbies there is much comment and heated discussion and it all indicates that this is precisely how this aggression against one of the smallest states in the world has been received: practically in one and the same way, without any variance of opinion.

[Shishlin] Yes, the territory of Grenada is...

[Kobysh -- interrupting] ... 200 square km, and...

[Shishlin -- continuing] ... the population numbers 110,000.

[Kobysh] Yes, and the armed forces are merely 800 men strong. This is, practically speaking, a police force. Against that, there are 11 modern warships with heavy artillery, helicopters, aircraft; tanks are being transferred by transport aircraft; there are landing troops with training from Vietnam among other places. And one begins to perceive, as Nikolay Vladimirovich correctly pointed out, that this is of course directed not only at Grenada. This is something more than a mere warning. Clearly, having now abolished the progressive system in Grenada and having reinstated there the former governor general, they want at the same time to turn the island into their base for neocolonialist imperialist action directed against the peoples living in the region, and in the whole of Latin America. This is, in general, an act of international terrorism.

[Shishlin] Essentially, one is now forced to reflect on the frequent sermons preached by the Reagan administration regarding the code of behavior in the international community. Well, what kind of code is theirs? It is the code of behavior of highway robbers. But of course the U.S. has no cause for triumphant celebrations. In the Security Council, even very close U.S. allies consider it prudent to distance themselves from this aggression in the attitude they take, and this speaks for itself. And again, when in fact the U.S. is suffering a political setback in consequence of this aggression -- as it undoubtedly is, as a result of this intervention -- then there is no cause for celebration.

[Kobysh] There is also here a very interesting time coincidence. Several days before the aggression took place -- 5 days, to be precise -- President Reagan, speaking at a press conference, said virtually as follows: The U.S. is carrying on subversive activities in various countries, it will continue to do so, and considers this to be normal. Well, this is quite unheard of. Nothing like it is known in the history of international relations. This is without precedent. The subversive terrorist activities of the CIA and other U.S. secret services were being declared to be legitimate, normal, legal as it were. And in fact now this kind of activity has reached a state-level activity on the part of the United States toward little Grenada and its people numbering, as you said, 110,000 people.

[Shislin] Yes, and another detail: The House of Representatives in the U.S. Congress already, I think three times this year, has forbidden the administration to use secret means and set aside appropriations for financing secret subversive activities against Nicaragua. And every time the Senate majority -- which belongs to the Republicans, that is Reagan's Republican party -- decisively blocks these resolutions passed by the House of Representatives. The secret activities go on, and not only the secret ones but, alas, the overt ones too.

[Kobysh] What used to be considered secret activity so to sepak and feel inside the CIA domain, is now being carried out -- already openly -- by the U.S. Armed Forces. The same banditry has reached, so to speak, state level and is proclaimed as official U.S. policy.

## U.S. 'Threat' to Nicaragua

[Levin] We mentioned already that the aggression against Grenada, the intervention against Grenada, is of course aimed not only at that country. It is notable that within the same few days the Soviet Government made a statement drawing world public attention to the subversive activities, to the preparations for a similar intervention on the part of the United States against Nicaragua. This statement says plainly that the aggressive actions of the United States have created a serious threat to the sovereignty and security of the Republic of Nicaragua, and the situation in the whole of Central America has been exacerbated. Washington does not limit itself to making use of counterrevolutionary rabble in the role of the first echelon of interventionist forces.

The people of Nicaragua are threatened with direct invasion by U.S. troops. The same actions are being taken as those which were taken with respect to Grenada. The Americans would very much like to use also against Nicaragua its own neighbors in the first place. But even at the time when the issue of intervening in Grenada arose, the majority of Caribbean countries -- members of the Caricom organization -- refused to participate. When the president of Guyana was asked to take part in the invasion, he answered that he could, instead, send his troops to defend the inviolability of Grenada against the invasion of foreign troops, and he refused to support this invasion. The leaders of Trinidad and Tobago, and of the Bahamas also did not support the idea of invasion. It would appear that these states, over which the United States has some leverage, also dissociate themselves. And in Latin America, quite justifiably, many prominent spokesmen have asked the question: Grenada today, who will be next tomorrow?

In this connection it is being recalled that the past record of the U.S. imperialists is full of similar actions -- Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, the invasion in the Bay of Pigs. But what the Washington administration is doing today is really, as Vitaliy Ivanovich stressed, international terrorism in action. And it is being covered up by talk about the restoration of democracy on Grenada.

The British newspaper GUARDIAN wrote: What democracy are they talking about? It is democracy to reinstate Gairy -- who surrounded himself with protectors like the Haitian Tonton Macoute -- and was removed from power by his own people? Yes, this kind of democracy, democracy in the U.S. style, is what they are trying to impose on Grenada today, and whose turn will it be tomorrow? Naturally, very very serious questions arise here. The newspaper LIBERATION wrote that the U.S. intervention against Grenada will boost the antinuclear movement in Europe. This is logical. The whole world today can see how lightly and unthinkingly the Washington administration reaches out to use military actions.

[Kobysh -- interrupting] ...of course, assumes a frightening and quite ominous character for the Europeans. If they can act this way in Grenada, why will they be any different in Europe? Generally the reprisal against the people of Grenada, just as the attempts to suppress the national liberation movement in the other countries of the region, the whole undeclared war against Nicaragua, the genocide in El Salvador, the virtual occupation by U.S. troops now of Lebanon, the aid given to the racists in their criminal actions against the peoples in the south of Africa -- these are after all the links of a single chain, the confirmation that Washington is pursuing an undisguised imperialist policy with the direct use of crude military force. The leaders of the United States now appear as some of the most evil enemies of all freedom-loving peoples.

'Dead End' in Middle East

[Levin] Take even the events in Lebanon -- there is much talk and discussion in the United States and regret is expressed over the death of the Marines, but these are the very same Marines who perpetrated the reprisal against the people of Grenada and the same Marines who have been killing in Lebanon not only servicemen but women and children. Not a single tear rolled from the eyes of President Reagan, who so loves to don the robes of the peacemaker and humanist.

[Shishlin] In Lebanon the side that is suffering is the Lebanese people, and the cause that is being hurt is the just cause of the Arabs. And we believe that to solve disputes there one must rely on the universal method, the method of negotiation, the method employing energetic political, not military, means. And it seems to me that this use of force everywhere, this reckless reliance on force, so characteristic of the present U.S. Administration, is inevitably proving costly both for the international position of this administration and for how people perceive the United States.

[Kobysh] It is turning into a dead end for Washington itself. In the Near East, after all, the United States has now reached a dead end. The Washington leaders do not know what to do. They simply do not know. Well, one can kill a few more people, but then what? After all, at one time there had been serious talk, serious proposals from our side, for them to stop killing, stop thinking that they would be able to deceive someone, and to stop the machinations at the Camp David talks. One has to sit down to negotiate seriously with all interested parties, with respect for the position of each side, to reach some agreement on a just solution to all the burning issues that have now acquired such an explosive nature. They did not listen. So now they are beating their heads against a wall, as one says, not knowing what to do. Meanwhile blood is being shed.

[Levin] So far, judging by reports from Washington, Reagan wants to realize his plan, as he puts it, to achieve peace in the Near East.

But this plan lacks the main thing -- the satisfaction of the legitimate rights and interests of the Arab people of Palestine. This means once again that even this plan cannot be realized, because it is unrealistic, and it is not directed at establishing a stable and just peace in the Near East.

[Shishlin] Yes, which would guarantee the security and the right to peaceful coexistence of all the states and peoples of this region, including, of course, Israel.

'Socialist States' Stress 'Unity'

[Levin] Ofcourse, this recklessness of the Washington administration is causing acute problems and is contributing to the extreme international situation that has been taking shape recently. Strictly speaking, it is this recklessness that also determines the complexity of the international situation. This is precisely why it is reckless. In these conditions the socialist states are stressing the necessity to strengthen further unity and cohesion. This thought now resounds, literally, at all the meetings of representatives from the socialist countries. This was the case at the session of the heads of government level of the CEMA states, during the conversations of the Soviet party and government delegation led by Comrade Aliyev in Vietnam. It was this topic of strengthening unity and cooperation among the fraternal socialist countries that was very widely discussed at the latest Politburo session, as the official report indicates.

[Shishlin] Then there are, strictly speaking, two important thoughts about which we do not tire of talking. The first is that the socialist countries are capable of reliably protecting their security and that the way to deal with the imperial policy of the United States can and will be found. Second, we believe that there are still opportunities to move away from the dangerous edge toward which the policy of the present U.S. Administration is pushing the world. Consequently, the socialist countries are continuing the international dialogue. They are operating actively, energetically and purposefully. When we talk of the cohesion of the countries of socialism, this cohesion finds a natural expression in those collective meetings and in all the intensive bilateral contacts that are maintained among the socialist countries, and also in quite practical and palpable actions with a single aim -- to preserve peace in Europe, to preserve international security, to put life back into the process of detente, and to instill in it a new rhythm.

[Kobysh] And to preserve universal peace. When we say that unity is needed now, the unity of the socialist countries is of vital importance for the cause of preserving universal peace. But now there is also a need for the unity of all the people who wish to survive. The threat has become universal. The threat posed by this thoughtless, irresponsible course of the United States -- and generally speaking it is purely and simply an imperialist course -- is equally terrible for every country, and everyone must unite. The demonstrations and protests have developed beyond what was thought possible a year ago.

[Levin] In the replies of Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov to the appeal of the Third International Congress of World Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, which are published today in the press, it is stressed that the Soviet Union will continue to do all it can to reduce international tension and to curb the arms race, whether on earth or in space, and to prevent a nuclear conflagration.

[Shishlin] We are now defending the security of the whole of mankind. We are defending the security of the world. We are defending the opportunity -- and we are striving to use the opportunity -- to ensure that the future of human history is calm and peaceful, a time for constructive labor and not a time for feverish military preparations with completely unpredictable consequences. It seems to me that it is to this policy, which is really in harmony with the aspirations of mankind, that the future belongs.

[Levin] Esteemed comrades, here we conclude our program. Thank you for your attention. All the best.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS'

LD281747 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 28 Oct 83

["International Situation: Questions and Answers" program, presented by Viktor Anikin, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator; with Vladimir Konstantinovich Katin, APN political observer; and Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, All-Union Radio and television political observer]

## Soviet 'Peace Offensive'

[Excerpts] [Anikin] Our country is continuing its peace offensive. This is shown by the proposals raised by Comrade Andropov in his replies to questions from a PRAVDA correspondent published on 27 October. The Soviet Union has made yet another important step in the direction of achieving an agreement at the Soviet-U.S. Geneva talks on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe. I am asking APN political observer Vladimir Konstantinovich Katin to talk about its significance and meaning. If you please.

[Katin] These days, when impressive demonstrations are being held all over the world in the framework of the disarmement action week, our country has made new, additional proposals to save Europe from the threat of nuclear war. I mean the new initiatives raised by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. I shall dwell somewhat further on his replies to the questions of a PRAVDA correspondent, on their essence. Firstly let us take an overall look at the situation at the Soviet-U.S. Geneva talks on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe. There is, alas, no progress there toward accord: There is still a deadlock situation. Why is this? In the 2 years of the talks, our country has proposed a broad range of possible measures, from substantial reductions in nuclear medium-range systems to the total liquidation of all types of nuclear weapons altogether in Europe.

These proposals do not harm anyone's interests. The position of the United States is different. The Soviet Union, in its view, should reduce its nuclear medium-range weapons, while NATO should build its up. Ths is ridiculous, and one must not count on progress at the talks in such a situation. But is there a way out of the deadlock that has come about in Geneva, all the same? So far, there is a way out. The Soviet Union will not refrain from seeking accord until the United States by its actions -- by the deployment of new nuclear missiles in Western Europe -- makes this accord impossible. We have displayed and are displaying flexigility, the leader of our party and state says, in trying to find specific solutions, as long as one, invariable requirement is observed: The balance of forces in Europe in medium-range nuclear weapons must not be upset.

What does the requirement mean in practice? Firstly, new U.S. missiles should not be deployed in Europe, since this would sharply change the entire military-strategic situation on the continent in favor of the NATO bloc. Secondly, both parties should take into account all nuclear systems of the corresponding range, without any exception.

Our concept is as follows: The level of medium-range nuclear weapons on both sides can and must be radically lowered, but in such a way that the correlation of force between them remains unchanged.

At times appeals are made in the West to the Soviet Union to show good will and unilaterally reduce the quantity of its medium-range missiles. But the way I see it, one must dot all the i's in this matter. Such good will from the Soviet Union exists. In effect we are already doing this. Over the period of the talks we have removed from our armory several dozen medium-range missiles in Europe.

We also halted additional deployment of missiles beyond the Urals from where they could reach the countries of Western Europe. And if it proves possible to conclude an agreement in Geneva on a just basis, a considerable portion of the SS-20 missiles will also be eliminated.

Our position at Geneva is not inflexible, as it is distortedly interpreted at times in the West. Flexibility and a constructive attitude, striving to seek mutually acceptable compromises are contained in the new, additional initiatives just proposed by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov. It is proposed to leave in Europe only 140 launch installations for SS-20 missiles; that is noticeably fewer than the launch installations for the medium-range missiles of Britain and France, which, incidentally have 162 of them.

[Anikin] Forgive me for interrupting, Vladimir Konstantinovich, that is on the condition of ensuring equality of warheads between the USSR and NATO?

[Katin] If an agreement is reached with the United States in Geneva, the Soviet Union is prepared to eliminate all its missiles being reduced in the European zone, instead of relocating them in the East.

[Anikin] But some people are expressing the fear that the missiles, so they say, could be moved back in the opposite direction.

[Katin] In order to dispel all doubts on that score, we directly state today that there will be no movement of missiles from East to West. And lastly, the Soviet Union is prepared to establish for itself and for NATO equal overall levels of medium-range carrier-aircraft. Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov categorically rejected the statements being made in Western countries alleging that, with the start of deployment of U.S. missiles, the talks will become more productive. This is the purest deception, aimed at abating the intensity of the struggle of the West European peoples against the appearance of U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe. In this way, the appearance of new U.S. missiles in Western Europe will make a continuation of the talks now being held in Geneva impossible. On the other hand, the talks can be continued if the United States does not embark on the actual deployment of these missiles.

## Antiwar Compaign 'Unprecedented'

[Anikin] Vladimir Konstaninovich, it is known that an antiwar campaign has arisen of a size and scale unprecedented in history against the deployment of these missiles in Europe. It shows, incidentally, that the kindlers of war and nuclear adventurists do not have wide support in their own countries.

[Katin] Yes indeed. We see a clear gap, I would even call it a gulf, between the peoples and their governments.

It is not 1939 now, nor 1941; it is immeasurably more dangerous to play with the split atom than to play with guns. And our leader Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, is unequivocally warning the West that in the nuclear age the world must not be viewed through a chink, through narrow, selfish interests. Responsible statesmen have one choice, to do everything to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. Any other position is short-sighted, moreover suicidal. It is a very, very timely warning. There is still time to recognize it and draw the conclusions. The main thing is not to permit it, not to allow a nuclear Vesuvius to overwhelm our common planet earth.

## U.S. Uses 'Gunboat Diplomacy'

[Anikin] Thank you, Vladimir Konstantinovich. Radio listener Petr Sviridov from Kimry writes to us: In connection with the situation in Central America, we often see in our press the words gunboat diplomacy. What does this definition mean? When did it arise?

The Reagan administration has actively included gunboat diplomacy in the collection of actions of its adventurist course on the international scene. What is more, it has also extended its geography, having made a Middle East state such as Lebanon the object of crude interference with the aid of Marines and ships of the U.S. Navy. To a greater extent than before, gunboat diplomacy has been launched by Washington in Latin America. Striving to stifle the people's Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua, the U.S. Administration is resorting to a show of strength off its coast. U.S. squadrons comprising dozens of ships are roving to West and East near Nicaragua in the waters of the Pacific Ocean and Caribbean Sea.

Well, the latest example of brazen interference by the United States in the affairs of other countries is the armed intervention against Grenada, a small island state in the Caribbean basin. It was carried out with the same scenario as has been used in the United States for over 100 years now, by resorting to gunboat diplomacy.

## Situation in Eritrea Discussed

Vitaliy Mikhaylovich Baribin from Kiev asks us to talk about the Eritrean problem. Eritirea is one of the provinces of Ethiopia located on the Red Sea coast. Its population is about 2 million and its territory 130,000 sq km. The main town is Asmara. It often happens that in order to understand the present one has to turn to the past. This is also so in the case of Eritrea. In the second half of the 19th century, the period of formation of a single Ethiopian state started, as did the strengthening of the central authorities. An the same time, it was precisely then that the peoples of Ethiopia were forced to fight, first against British and then Italian aggressors. In the seventies and eighties Ethiopia was drawn into wars with Egypt and Sudan. The weakness of Ethiopia during these wars was exploited by Italy. Italian troops gradually succeeded in seizing a number of areas of northern Ethiopia.

At the beginning of 1890, Italy announced the formation there of the colony of Eritrea, although up to that time such a country had not existed. The colonial yoke was thrown off only after World War II. The striving of the local population for freedom was used by separatists in furtherance of their interests. They set as their goal to break Eritrea away from the rest of Ethiopia. They unleashed an armed struggle in the province. In this help was given to the separatists by imperialist forces, which had long had their eye on this strategically important area on the Red Sea.

The 1974 revolution in Ethiopia inherited the Eritrean problem. Despite all the efforts of the revolutionary powers to solve the question by peaceful means, the separatists turned the land into a battlefield. As a result, considerable damage was done to the province's economy and the problem of refugees arose. And still, despite all their efforts, the separatists did not manage to gain any significant successes. The changes in public life and the nationalities policy of the new revolutionary authorities, based on the quality of all ethnic groups of Ethiopia, gradually opened people's eyes to the real state of things. The separatist movement started to weaken, although let us note that to this day it still exists. And again let us emphasize here the unseemly role of the imperialist and neocolonialist circles of the West, which are manipulating the gangs of schismatics in their own selfish interests, supplying them with money and weapons.

As a result of joint efforts by the revolutionary army and population of Eritrea the bandits are now demoralized and will soon be finally dirven from their hiding-places, the Ethiopian HERALD wrote. At present, the question of peaceful construction is on the is on the agenda in Eritrea. The campaign to restore and develop Eritrea has been called Red Star. Over the past year and a half 20 industrial enterprises have been restored in the province, 24 hospitals and out-patients' clinics have been rebuilt as have hundreds of residential houses. About 200 km of roads have been repaired and built. New jobs are being created. Refugees who left the area because of the separatists' excesses are returning to their homes. Life is being organized in Eritrea. Problems are being efficiently solved by the revolutionary authorities.

Reagan Criticized in U.S.

There are many letters in our mailbag from listeners sharply condemning the aggressive policy of U.S. ruling circles which is posing a serious threat to peace throughout the world. At the same time quite a few of our listeners draw attention to the fact that the policy of the present Washington administration runs contrary to the interests of the Americans themselves, the ordinary people of the United States. President Reagan, writes Comrade Bakin from Orel, by his aggressive actions which are leading to bloodshed in various parts of the world and are posing the threat of nuclear war, has shamed the Untied States. How can President Reagan not take account of his own people, asks Yakov Tikhonovich Makarov from the village of Kirvozerye, Penza Oblast. Our regular listener Pavel Andreyevich Shtukalov from the town of Votkinsk also writes: Reagan is a man who has frustrated the hopes of the American people and, although he has not met a single one of his election promises, intends to run for a second term as President. Surely ordinary Americans will not allow themselves to be deceived a second time. I will ask our political observer, Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, to answer these letters and questions.

[Zholkver] First of all, I should say that according to reports in the U.S. press, views such as you have quoted from the letters of our listeners are currently being voiced by many Americans too. Moreover, one gets the impression that as we go on there are more and more such criticism from Americans, and not just from those whom it is customary to call ordinary people but also from highly experienced and quite influential political and public figures in the United States.

Here is one of the most recent examples. All seven contenders for the U.S. Presidency from the Democratic Party -- and they include a former vice president and four senators -- have come out against the production of the new U.S. strategic missile, the MX. In a joint letter to the Military Appropriations Committee [as heard] of the U.S. Congress, they come out against what they call the sheer waste of U.S. taxpayers' money on developing a military system incapable of reinforcing U.S. national security. And all seven contenders say that if they are elected president, not one of them will ask for money for these purposes.

Of course, one has to bear in mind that behind these and certain other similar pronouncements there stand the interests of the election battle, the desire to win a elector's votes. However, it is noteworthy that criticism of the military programs and plans of the present Washington administration is being made by many eminent U.S. figures who are not involved in the election struggle. Let us take, for example, Robert McNamara. He is a former U.S. defense secretary, a man who for many years ran the Pentagon and has an excellent knowledge of both U.S. military doctrine and the state of the U.S. Armed Forces. Indidentally, McNamara is not exactly a pensioner but the president of the Council for Economic Development. And so this figure declares that from the military viewpoint there is no need to deploy Pershings and cruise missiles in Western Europe. This, stresses McNamara, would create an extremely dangerous situation and any, even limited, nuclear war would lead to the destruction of everything living on earth.

I would personally add to McNamara's noteworthy admission that, as is known, the theory of a limited nuclear war was put forward by Washington under President Reagan. And in point of fact, this is not just a matter of theory but above all of the everyday practice of the present Washington administration. After all, as our listeners rightly point out, the actions of that administration lead to conflicts and bloodshed in the most varied parts of the globe. Suffice it to recall just the latest two U.S. military interventions, in Lebanon and Grenada. President Reagan, who is so fond of going on radio to address the Americans and pronouncing fine words about liberty and human rights, is sending U.S. troops against peoples who are defending their freedom, independence and human dignity. In Lebanon and Grenada completely innocent, peaceful people have perished from U.S. bombs and shells.

But Americans themselves have died, soldiers of the sadly-renowned U.S. Marines. And this makes not just their relatives and friends but also many other Americans concerned and indignant. The well-known television commentator, Chancellor, notes with bitter irony: Washington has effectively stated that if U.S. Marines are killed in Beirut then everything has to be done to make sure they are killed in Grenada too. A situation comes about whereby the crisis in the Middle East leads to a crisis in the Caribbean too. One political disaster leads to another.

In conclusion, I would like to quote another pronouncement by a highly authoritative American, one of the directors of the Center for Strategic Studies, Rober Hunter. U.S. presidents, he writes in THE LOS ANGELES TIMES newspaper, adore taking little bits of paper out of their inside top pockets which note the outstanding achievements of the administrations they head. As election time draws nearer, the list of such successes drawn out of their pockets becomes longer and longer. When such bits of paper come out of President Reagan's pocket, there is going to be nothing for him to read. No real successes have been achieved in securing a peace settlement in the Middle East and other seats of tension. No agreements have ben concluded on arms control. No progress has been achieved in the development of the economy and trade.

One cannot but agree with this observation by the U.S. scholar. Yes, on the threshold of the presidential election next year, Ronald Reagan really does have nothing to boast about. But I would like to talk about another thing. Presidential elections in the United States have not for a long time now been a genuine expression of the will of the people. I would recall that during the last election, when Reagan came to power, 46 percent of Americans with the right to vote did not take part in the polling. And how many Americans, for one or another reason, from racial discrimination to simple illiteracy, are deprived altogether of that right in the United States, which they so love to advertise as a model of democracy.

[Anikin] Thank you, Aleksandr Vladimirovich.

U.S. ACTION ON GRENADA CRITICIZED AT UN

'U.S. Political Isolation' Viewed

LD301004 Moscow TASS in English 0913 GMT 30 Oct 83

[Text] New York October 30 TASS -- Representatives of more than 60 United Nations member states have addressed the U.N. Security Council on behalf of their governments during a debate on the U.S. aggression against Grenada, vividly demonstrating the indisputable fact of U.S. political isolation. Not a single word was heard in the Security Council hall in justification of the United States' military intervention against Grenada and its gross interference in the internal affairs of that sovereign state. The only exceptions were the aggressor country itself and the states that are the immediate accomplices in its crime.

Even such Washington allies among the Security Council members as France, the Netherlands and Pakistan denied it support since they would not like to share any moral responsibility with the United States for its act of international gangsterism.

As indicated by statements by representatives of most diverse states, the U.S. intrusion into Grenada is viewed throughout the world as an encroachment on the very foundation of international relations, whose immutable principles are respect for the sovereignty of other states, non-interference in their home affairs, territorial immunity, and renunciation of the use or force of the threat of using it.

The U.S. Government trampled underfoot all these fundamental principles that are contained in the U.N. Charter. Mexican representative Porfirio Munoz Ledo, among others, branded the U.S. armed invasion of Grenada as an open violation of basic standards of international law.

As justly said by permanent observer of the Arab League Clovis Maksoud [TASS spelling] the method of conducting international affairs that had been demonstrated in Grenada in recent days affected the interests of all as such actions ignored the legal foundation of the U.N. Charter and were creating a dangerous precedent. If they were not cut short, the entire international legislation would be called into question.

The victim today was Grenada, said Tanzanian representative Paul Rupia, but tomorrow its lot might be shared by any other developing country. The pretext today was to evacuate U.S. citizens and restore so-called democratic institutions. The pretext tomorrow could be to change domestic and foreign policies of other states that the invading country did not like or to replace regimes that it would consider subversive.

Many states expressed their deep concern in the United Nations about the U.S. making short work of Grenada seen by them as a prelude to even more dangerous and unrestrained military adventures on the part of U.S. imperialists.

## U.S. Branded 'With Infamy'

LD290038 Moscow TASS in English 2355 GMT 28 Oct 83

["The Aggressor in the Dock" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow October 28 TASS -- TASS political commentator Nikolay Chigir writes:

The whole world brands with infamy the Washington administration, which has carried out with unprecedented cynicism a bloody attack against the independent Grenadian people who never posed any whatsoever threat to anyone. The monstrosity of this bandit operation is so obvious that not a single state in the world found it possible to solidarize in the slightest way with the American aggressors. Of course one should not include in the count the openly pro-American puppet regimes in a number of countries, to be more precise regimes on America's payroll, whom Washington is vainly trying to use as a cover for its outright aggression against Grenada. Even the most loyal allies of the United States -- its associates in military-political blocs -- hastened at least to dissociate themselves from their mighty imperialist mentor, while many of them unambiguously condemned its bandit action.

The world community has placed Reagan and his team in the dock and unanimously passed a severe sentence over them for their crime against peace and humanity.

The meeting of the United Nations Security Council, at which the United States armed intervention against Grenada was discussed, and its results confirmed the total isolation of the aggressors in the international arena. Eleven of the 15 members of the council voted for the draft resolution that firmly condemns the American invasion of Grenada as a flagrant violation of international law, as an encroachment on the independence, sovereignty and territorial inviolability fo this Caribbean state and demands an immediate end to the intervention and the withdrawal of all occupation forces from the island. No helping hand was extended to Washington also by such countries as Britain, Zaire and Togo which abstained during the vote. As to the position of the aggressor country which, using the right of veto as a permanent member of the Security Council, blocked the formal adoption of the resolution, it only demonstrated once again the Reagan administration's total disregard for the world community in the person of the United Nations Organisation, for the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and generally accepted norms of international law.

The present Washington leadership, which claims the role of shaper of the destiny of the world, has ranged itself against all states and peoples, the whole of mankind. This was stressed by the absolute majority of the representatives of more than 50 countries who took part in the work of the meeting of the United Nations Security Council.

They wrathfully condemned Washington's armed brigandage in Grenada, exposed the unprecedented hypocricy and demagogy that Washington constantly uses in camouflaging its dirty doings. Summing up the main points of these speeches, it can be said that the main question that gives rise to the most serious alarm in the world is the following: Is there any limit to the Reagan administration's imperial ambitions, does it have any breaks to avoid crossing the line in front of which any thinking person must stop? Today, it was said by representatives of various countries in the United Nations Organisation, American occupation forces are trampling the soil of Grenada, sowing there death and devastation, while tomorrow the same can happen with any other country of Latin America, Asia or Africa should Washington decide to "install order and democracy" there as Reagan sees them.

The whole of peaceloving mankind demands a barrier to be built on the road of the hegemonistic ambitions of American imperialism, an end to the increasingly mounting scope of armed banditism. This demand found its convincing expression also in the course of the meeting of the United Nations Security Council.

## Criticism By Nonaligned Cited

LD282238 Moscow TASS in English 2135 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 28 TASS -- TASS observer Vasiliy Kharkov writes:

The U.S. aggression against Grenada is one of the most obvious manifestations of Washington's hostile attitude to the Nonaligned Movement as a whole. This was, specifically, said by representatives of many nonaligned countries who addressed a special meeting of the Security Council when the question of the United States' armed intervention against Grenada was discussed there.

Grenada among 10 other United Nations countries is a participant in the Nonaligned Movement which always condemned resolutely the use of force and interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Since its formation in 1961 the Nonaligned Movement has been defending consistently the right of all countries to independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, the inalienable right of people to choose freely their own political, economic and social system.

These principles which received a broad international recognition have stood the test of time. They are fully in accord with the United Nations Charter and have been reflected in many of its decisions. The practical steps of nonaligned countries based on these principles have been highly assessed by the world community.

The political declaration adopted by the nonaligned summit conference in New Delhi last spring confirmed again that the Nonaligned Movement rejects resolutely all the forms of subjugation, dependence, intervention, overt or covert, all the forms of pressure in international relations.

The conference condemned unanimously the secret and outright subversive actions of the imperialist forces against Grenada, expressed support for its government and people and urged all countries to respect Grenada's independence and sovereignty.

The U.S. armed invasion of Grenada showed Washington's contempt for this call coming from 100-odd countries, members of the Nonaligned Movement.

Washington treated the Nonaligned Movement with the unconcealed hostility from the first steps of that movement. The nonalignment policy has been proclaimed by Washington as "amoral". Many times the Washington administration tried to split the ranks of the Nonaligned Movement, to remove the very essence from that movement and President Reagan, expressing Washington's imperial aspirations, recently went so far as to declare that nonaligned countries cannot wait for the United States to assume their guidance.

The aggression that the United States unleashed against a small nonaligned country, Grenada, that did not threaten anyone in any way, shows clearly what is behind these U.S. aspirations -- the cult of power, the striving to impose the order suiting Washington by violence, arbitrariness and armed brigandage.

## TASS Statement at UN

LD290623 Moscow TASS in English 0619 GMT 29 Oct 83

[Text] New York October 29 TASS -- The text of a TASS statement of October 26, 1983, in which it is authorized to state that the Soviet Union strongly condemns the U.S. aggression against Grenada and denounces it as a crime against peace and mankind, has been circulated at the U.N. as an official document of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

COMMENTARY ON REAGAN'S GRENADA, LEBANON SPEECH

## President's Policy 'Illegal'

LD281602 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Following President Reagan's address to the nation broadcast by radio and television, the U.S. vetoed a resolution in the UN Security Council condemning its invasion of Grenada. We bring you a commentary by our observer Igor Dmitriyev:

To support President Reagan's claim that the U.S. got there just in time to prevent what he described as a Cuban takeover, Pentagon officials played an 8-minute film to journalists showing small arms captured on Grenada. The French news agency, in a dispatch from Washington, quotes a senior U.S. officer as saying that the arms and ammunition found would have enabled a battalion to hold out against the invaders for 30-45 days. To any sane person, this means only one thing. Namely, the Grenadian authorities anticipated an invasion and were getting ready for it. Holding out against the invaders for 30-45 days is not the same as building up an arsenal to capture Barbados or any other Caribbean nation.

That there could have been an invasion of Grenada was not without some foundation. It has turned out that contrary to statements by U.S. officials it was the United States that first suggested intervening in Grenada and not the Caribbean nations. What is more, the United States initiated discussions of an invasion on 15 October, a week sooner than Secretary of State George Shultz had first indicated. So presenting the military operation as simply an American response to an invitation by the Caribbean states is yet another falsehood to justify aggression.

The United States' unhappiness with Grenada has a long history. It dates back to 1979, when U.S. officials moved to disrupt the economy of the tiny nation. First of all the U.S. Administration sought to discourage some OPEC and West European nations from assisting Grenada in the construction of a new airstrip. Then the U.S. forced international lending institutions to cut loans to Grenada. The pattern of behavior toward Grenada was similar to that toward Chile when the progressive government of Salvador Allende came to power. The only difference between the two is that while President Allende was killed in a CIA-sponsored fascist coup, the invasion of Grenada was spearheaded by crack American troops.

Some congressional critics of the invasion say that in the case of Grenada, President Reagan displayed an illegal and unlawful policy. According to Representative Theodore Weiss of New York, and I quote: If we start making determinations on our own as to which governments we are going to overthrow or invade because we are not happy with who their allies are, we are going to have our hands full all over the world. Unquote. There is no place for suppositions; this is already taking place. Nicaragua is one of the most vivid examples. First the U.S. launches a hate campaign against the sovereign nation and resorts to political, financial, and military subversion, but when that nation takes steps to ensure a legitimate self-defense, it is labeled a base of foreign expansion.

When that senior U.S. officer said that the warehouses in Grenada contained the arms and ammunition that would have enabled a battalion to hold out against the invaders for 30-45 days, he probably meant that Grenada could hold out against a more or less equal enemy, not the U.S. with its transport aircraft, artillery, destroyers and gunships. U.S. Marines, Rangers and troops of the 82d Division were accompanied by some 300 troops from six Caribbean nations. Were they armed with self-made arms or those provided by the U.S.? And how many American arms and ammunitions could be found in the warehouses of those states?

## Statement 'Palpably False'

LD281805 Moscow TASS in English 1617 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Washington October 28 TASS -- President Reagan has made an impudent television speech which showed open disregard for the generally accepted standards of international law and which cannot be summed up as anything but an attempt to "justify" U.S. imperialist policy of banditry on the international scene.

In his bid to exonerate the U.S. impudent armed aggression against the small Caribbean insular state of Grenada Reagan made once again the palpably false allegation that the incursion into that country had been stated first of all to protect the U.S. citizens in the island whose lives, in his words, had been "threatened". "I believe," said the U.S. President, that "our government has a responsibility to go to the aid of its citizens if their right to life and liberty is threatened". That this thesis is far-fetched and mendacious is self-evident. The safety of the U.S. citizens in Grenada had been publicly guaranteed by the Grenadian authorities on more than one occasion.

That the Americans in that island were threatened by nothing was officially declared by the official spokesman for the White House and the State Department just a few days before the invasion. This was also declared by U.S. citizens living in Grenada themselves. The latter, however, are now beginning to claim the opposite -- after they were given "instructive talks" by representatives of the U.S. special services. In any case it was not concern for its citizens that motivated Washington. The U.S. Administration clearly used this feigned concern, like it is doing this elsewhere, as a pretext for sending its armed forces to occupy Grenada and topple the system existing there.

The second, equally false pretext cited by Reagan to justify the unprovoked attack on a sovereign non-aligned state was that the United States had "just" met a request from some of the members of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States "to forestall further chaos" in Grenada and "help restore law and order" there. "Last weekend, I was awakened in the early morning hours and told that six members of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States, joined by Jamaica and Barbados, had sent an urgent request that we join them in a military operation to restore order and democracy to Grenada," the President said. "The legitimacy of their request, plus my own concern for our citizens, dictated my decision." There was indeed no word there that wasn't a lie.

According to the authoritative public organization -- the Council of Hemispheric Affairs, the invasion of Grenada is a pre-planned and prepared in advance military action of the USA, which was "rehearsed" way back in 1981 in the course of the "Ocean Venture-81" exercises training the landing of the Marines on a "Caribbean island" with the aim of overthrowing an "unfriendly government" and replacing it with a regime welcome to Washington. The British newspaper GUARDIAN pointed out that in recent months the administration has been intensively searching for any pretext in order to launch a spectacular military operation south of its border. According to an AP agency report, the specific decision on an invasion of Grenada was taken by Reagan already in the middle of the past week -- several days before the meeting in Port of Spain, where, as Washington claims, a number of heads of East Caribbean countries allegedly decided to request the USA for assistance.

Reagan's mendacious version has been exposed even by Washington's assistants -- Prime Minister John Adams of Barbados and Prime Minister Edward Seaga of Jamaica, who let it on television that for the first time the idea of a military invasion of Grenada was put forward two weeks ago by an unnamed high-ranking representative of the Reagan administration, who was on a tour of the region.

As far as the "joint operation" is concerned, as American journalists write, an insignificant contingent of troops from east Caribbean countries, a total of nearly 300 soldiers, was not even allowed to take part in the military operations. That rabble was landed in the areas already occupied by the U.S. Marines.

Thus, the "request" for aid, to which Reagan is presently referring, is a crude fabrication, which Washington is using as a fig leaf to cover its largest interventionist action after Vietnam, which was carried out from beginning to end solely by the U.S. Marines and a U.S. invasion force.

Reagan also advocated a determined use of military force in another "hot spot" of the world -- Lebanon, where an America occupation corps of the Marines has been stationed for more than a year now. He reserved for himself the "right" to widen military interference in Lebanon, by stressing that the Middle East is of paramount significance for the West's economic and political life, in view of its strategic position and the West's dependence on Middle East oil for the energy to fuel their industries.

The American President flew in such a passion that he even threatened to use the U.S. military machine practically in any part of the world, stressing that a threat to the security of the USA may arise far from the American coasts and that the United States shall not shun responsibility borne by it for upholding its interests.

The statement by the U.S. President is fresh evidence of the fact that the U.S. Administration has institutionalised international terror as its state policy. This is far from being an abstract argument by the President, but is being already actively implemented in practice; his words are translated into a practical language, including open and clandestine wars waged by the USA in Afghanistan, Lebanon, Grenada and Nicaragua. In the past they used to say diffidently that the CIA was allegedly not implicated in secret subversive operations abroad, were trying to whitewash it in some way or other. At the present time this all has been openly proclaimed a state policy.

This is a new despicable phenomenon in the history of international relations. It runs counter to the norms of international law, the U.N. Charter, all principles of mutual relations between states. Nowadays, from Reagan's viewpoint, from the viewpoint of his practical actions, a regime which does not correspond to the U.S. standard may become a target of either secret subversive activities, or of a direct armed invasion. The landing of troops in done under the pretext of "protection of the rights" of the American population or soldiers. But when troops are already introduced into the territory of another state and its government is overthrown, it is declared that this all has been done on a legitimate basis.

Washington's actions demonstrate the whole danger of the policy of brigandage elevated to the level of state policy. Acts of subversion, propaganda and preparation for war are the characteristic features of the course of actions by the present administration, which is pharisaically using verbiage on love of "freedom", "democracy" and "human rights" as a cover for its aggressive ambitions.

## USSR PROTESTS 'BANDIT ATTACK' ON EMBASSY IN GRENADA

LD281801 Moscow TASS in English 1730 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 28 TASS -- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR today presented to the United States Embassy a note of the following content:

On October 26, 1983 the Embassy of the USSR in Saint Georges was fired on by planes of the American Air Force. As a result of this bandit attack one of the embassy staff members was wounded.

Thereby, on having perpetrated a brazen aggression against the independent Grenadian state, the United States made yet another crime by encroaching on the inviolability of a diplomatic mission and directly endangering the life of its staff members.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR states a resolute protest against the bandit actions committed against the Soviet Embassy in Grenada, warns that such actions may have serious consequences and again declares that the Government of the United States bears full responsibility for the life and security of Soviet citizens in Grenada.

Confirmed simultaneously is the demand for the immediate withdrawal from there of all the interventionist forces.

SHULTZ HAS 'UNPLEASANT' SESSIONS WITH ALLIES

LD302238 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 30 Oct 83

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Vsevolod Ovchinnikov]

[Text] In connection with the explosion in Beirut, U.S. Secretary of State Shultz had to urgently visit Europe this week, for talks with the foreign ministers of Britain, France, and Italy. Along with the United States, these countries have soldiers in the so-called multinational forces in Lebanon.

But apart from the painful theme of the Lebanese crisis, Shultz this time found himself having several unpleasant explanation sessions with his allies in connection with the invasion of Grenada too. And the results of this action have an aspect which is very unwelcome to NATO: It has strengthened the depiction of Reagan as a man who shoots first, and only afterward wonders if it is necessary to fire. In the words of the British paper FINANCIAL TIMES, even more serious doubts have arisen in the minds of the West European allies: Can the U.S. Administration be trusted, especially in questions connected with the deployment of Tomahawks and Pershings?

So everything comes full circle. All the main lines of last week's international events are intertwined.

CASEY 'IGNORES' UN CHARTER, INTERNATIONAL LAWS

LD301302 Moscow TASS in English 1118 GMT 30 Oct 83

[Text] Washington October 30 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksander Lyutiy reports: After staging its act of banditry against Grenada, the Reagan administration is clearly preparing for further interventions against sovereign developing states whose policies are disliked by the White House. This is the only conclusion that can be drawn from a provocative speech made by C.I.A. Director William Casey, U.S. "spy number one", on Saturday in the city of Fulton, Missouri. Obviously encouraged by the bloody "successes" of U.S. cutthroats in Grenada, Casey, who had been himself most actively involved in preparations for the aggression against that country, declared it was now time to work out a broad strategy of combatting the communist threat in the entire developing world.

It is his view that the United States now should simply make it a rule to intrude into any developing state where revolutionary changes come into conflict with so-called "U.S. interests". The U.N. Charter and other international legal documents prohibiting interference in the affairs of other sovereign states are something the C.I.A. chief choses to ignore.

As is known, the agency headed by Casey is already waging an unprecedently large-scale "undeclared war" against revolutionary Nicaragua, training and arming gangs of bloody hangmen from among the Somoza following and sending them into that country. Casey's statement indicated that this criminal activity will be given an added boost. He bluntly urged, for example, a more intensive training of counter-revolutionary bands.

The aggression against Grenada, THE WASHINGTON POST said in this connection today, had become a dress rehearsal for an incursion into Nicaragua. The latter-day conquistador in the White House, it said, could now decide to send marines to topple another government that had got on his nerves. Casey's statement only bore this conclusion out once again.

There is something tragically symbolic in the fact that the chief of the U.S. spy agency chose to make his instigatory statement in the very city where Churchill made his notorious "Fulton speech" 37 years ago, proclaiming the start of "cold war" and a "crusade" against communism.

PENTAGON 'PREEMPTING' MILITARY BUDGET DEBATES

PM291402 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 5

[S. Agafonov "Rejoinder": "Pentagon and Elections"]

[Text] The U.S. presidential elections are approaching swiftly. Numerous candidates are taking up starting positions and election programs are being amended. Fighting strategies and tactics are being elaborated with a view to the forthcoming marathon. As THE NEW YORK TIMES reports, the Pentagon has been preparing its arguments on the threshold of the future elections. We are talking of the draft military budget for 1985.

As is known, the current fiscal year of 1984 began on 1 October. However, Congress has not yet adopted the draft law on military appropriations. U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger believes that the requested sums will definitely be cut on Capitol Hill, so the next draft budget must not only contain substantial increases in funds for military needs, but must also cover the billions which Congress may cut. Proceeding from these simple deductions, the Pentagon is requesting an increase of almost 18 percent in "defense spending" in comparison with the current year. According to the draft budget, appropriations will amount to the sum of $322.5 billion.

The reader may ask: Where do the elections come in here? It is all very simple. For the draft military budget for 1985 will become a "common topic" for all the candidates in the unfolding election campaign. In putting forward this draft on the eve of the elections, the Pentagon is announcing unambiguously what the militarist circles expect from the future president. Moreover, the new administration, whatever it may be, will inherit from its predecessors a very heavy burden of military spending, thus finding itself within set coordinates, so to speak. The Pentagon's draft budget for 1985 is thus a preemptive move and the first gain by the military-industrial complex in the period of the future Presidency.

The debates in Congress do not intimidate the current administration. As C. Weinberger said, "The President must not be restricted by the limits of Congress, but must submit a budget which takes account of the threat to national security." This is the Pentagon's main argument. A course of further increasing military spending and whipping up the arms race, and a gamble on militarism -- this is what C. Weinberger, and via him Reagan's whole "team," is voting for.

'JEOPARDIZED' SPACE SHUTTLE SCHEDULE NOTED

PM261058 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 83 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "'An Explosion Could Have Occurred'"]

[Excerpts] New York, 14 Oct -- The launching of the U.S. reusable spacecraft "Challenger" on 30 August this year under the Shuttle program almost ended in a catastrophe. It is clear from a statement by Major General J. Abrahamson, NASA associate director for space transportation systems, that at the launch phase the heat shield of one of the booster nozzles with whose aid ships of this type are put into near-earth orbit was almost completely burned away. If the nozzle wall had burned through to the section separating the booster from the auxiliary fuel tank, then a fire and an explosion could have occurred on the spacecraft.

ABC described this incident as "a serious blow to the entire Shuttle Program." NASA representatives point out that the launching of a reusable spaceship -- the "Columbia" this time -- scheduled for 5 November will almost certainly be deferred for at least a few weeks or even 1-2 months. All this in fact jeopardizes the fulfillment of the immediate flight schedule for spacecraft under the Shuttle program.

The malfunction which was detected was by no means the only one during Challenger's recent flight. As THE NEW YORK TIMES pointed out, "During the flight one of the spacecraft's on-board computers began to produce distorted information." According to the newspaper, "The most serious malfunctions were revealed when testing the new system for communicating between earth and the spacecraft." Observers recall that the first Challenger launching on 4 April was deferred repeatedly because of numerous malfunctions in the engines and other spacecraft systems.

U.S. EXPORTS 'DEATH, SLAVERY' WORLDWIDE

LD281517 Moscow TASS in English 1427 GMT 28 Oct 83

["Washington: A Course of Aggression, a Course of Terror" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow October 28 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

It must have been the first precedent in the history and practice of international relations. While in the past Washington, whose policy has long been dictated by the unbridled imperial ambitions and hegemonistic claims of the U.S. leadership, tried to deny U.S. involvement in operations aimed at overthrowing lawful governments, today, when U.S. troops are trampling upon the land of sovereign Grenada, these operations are publicly qualified as legitimate and terrorism is being openly institutionalized as government policy. This is being done by none other than the U.S. President and his closest retinue. In other words, Reagan and Co act on the international scene like terrorists and organizers of criminal actions the purpose of which is to establish U.S. diktat over sovereign countries and peoples.

Just a week ago, on October 20, addressing a press conference, Reagan publicly stated that covert operations were a component part of the actions of the authorities. The U.S. President disclosed no secret by that statement. The whole world knows that it is Washington that is the main organiser and breeding centre of international terrorism. According to the U.S. press, between 1961 and 1976 the CIA carried out about 900 terrorist operations against leading politicians and whole governments. The far from complete list of the victims of "special operations" carried out by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency and its mercenaries includes the name of Congolese national hero Patrice Lumumba; Solomon Bandaranaike, prime minister of Ceylon; Chilean President Salvador Allende; Mujibur Rahman, president of the People's Republic of Bangladesh; Marien Ngouabi, president of the People's Republic of Congo; Amilcar Cabral, general secretary of the African Independence Party of Guinea and Cape Verde Islands (PAGIC), outstanding Cuban Revolutionary Che Guevara and Panamanian leader General Omar Torrijos.

The world at large knows that Washington, acting in conjunction with the Zionist aggressor, is perpetrating one outrageous crime after another in the long-suffering Lebanon, knows that it is Washington that is arming the bandits sent into sovereign Afghanistan, trying to overthrow the legitimate government of Nicaragua, threatening revolutionary Cuba, and backing the blood-stained fascist junta usurping power in Chile.

The invasion of Grenada without precedent in cynicism and arrogance is a component in the further extension of the selfsame aggressive and hegemonistic policy. It is another example showing the worth of Washington's rhetoric about freedom, democracy and human rights and illustrating the standards which Washington follows in actual fact. It is direct evidence of Washington's intention to ignore the right of the peoples to independent development for the sake of its voracious ambitions and openly and brazenly to challenge the will of the peoples and world public opinion.

The nature of the approach of Reagan's team to international affairs has now been laid completely bare: If one regime or another does not meet Washington's standards, the U.S. leadership, trampling underfoot every norm of international law and the U.N. Charter, will try to subvert that regime by covert operations or merely, as in the case in Grenada, send against it the Marines, bring death and slavery to sovereign countries and people.

Having ordered the landing of U.S. Marines on Grenada, Reagan crushed every idea of law and morality and put the equation mark between his own actions and terrorism, between U.S. foreign policy and outright international banditry and brigandage accompanied by vicious war propaganda. The peoples must be vigilant in the face of these actions.

PRC TRADE UNION CONGRESS SESSION REVIEWED

LD292048 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT 29 Oct 83

[Text] Peking October 29 TASS -- The 10th congress of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions drew to a close here today. Delegates to the congress representing 73.3 million members of trade unions, discussed a report on the on the work of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions in the period under review, and examined an account of the financial activities of the federation. The congress adopted new rules of the federation and elected its guiding bodies, the executive committee and the secretariat. Ni Zhifu was re-elected chairman of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions.

The congress passed a resolution on the report. The document says that workers and employees of the country should actively raise their class consciousness, perfect professional knowledge and skill, work for raising economic efficiency and for a sounder spiritual climate in Chinese society.

SOVIET-CHINESE CONSULTATIONS TO RESUME IN MARCH

Third-Round Talks 'Frank'

LD291227 Moscow TASS in English 1218 GMT 29 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 29 TASS -- The third round of Soviet-Chinese consultations was held in Beijing on October 6-20. Leonid Ilichev, special representative of the government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, and Qian Qichen, special representative of the government of the People's Republic of China, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the PRC, exchanged views on the issue of normalisation of Soviet-Chinese relations.

Consultations were held in a calm and frank atmosphere, both sides consider the consultations to be useful.

The sides agreed to hold the next round of consultations in Moscow in March 1984.

Ilichev Delegation Departs

LD290845 Moscow TASS in English 0838 GMT 29 Oct 83

[Text] Beijing, October 29 TASS -- The special representative of the Government of the Soviet Union, deputy foreign minister of the USSR L. Ilichev left Beijing for Moscow today after completing the third round of the Soviet-Chinese political consultations. He was seen off at the airport by the special representative of the government and deputy foreign minister of the Chinese People's Republic Qian Qichen, the USSR Ambassador to the Chinese People's Republic I. Shcherbakov, as well as heads of diplomatic missions of a number of socialist countries accredited in Beijing.

MOSCOW WARNS OF GRENADA-LIKE RDF ACTION IN AREA

LD291833 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 29 Oct 83

[Text] Indian Minister for External Affairs Narasimha Rao, speaking at a parliamentary consultative committee of the Indian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stated that the militarization of Pakistan being carried out by the United States is leading to a growth in tension in South Asia. At the microphone is international affairs journalist Vladimir Beloshapka:

It is certainly not the first time that India has expressed its concern over extensive deliveries of American weapons to Pakistan, and, it should be said, it is not without grounds for doing so.

I will remind you, comrades, that a multibillion military deal has been concluded between Washington and Islamabad. In accordance with it, the Pakistan military regime obtains the most up-to-date combat technology from across the ocean. This includes Hercules C-130 planes and antiaircraft missile installations, and armored carriers, combat planes, harpoon seabased cruise missiles, and Grumman Mohawk surveillance aviation systems, and many others. Finally, the first batch of the last F-16 fighter bombers, capable of carrying nuclear weapons, has already arrived in Pakistan, General Ziaul Haq at one time threatened openly that if he has to force the Pakistan people to eat grass, they will acquire their own atom bombs.

You will agree that the appearance at one's very own doorstep of a neighbor armed to the teeth can hardly leave anyone in a state of indifference. And there is even more to ponder if one considers the aggressive mood gathering strength in Pakistani ruling circles. Is this not shown, for example, by the unwillingness of Islamabad to sign a treaty proposed by India on peace, friendship, and cooperation?

And what is the cost of the improper role of Pakistan rulers in the undeclared war against Afghanistan? It is from the territory of Pakistan that counterrevolutionary bands are intruding into Democratic Afghanistan -- armed, incidentally, with American weapons.

In a word, militaristic Pakistan, longing for nuclear weapons, has become a factor for destabilization of the situation in the region.

But the American-Pakistan military alliance has another side. Its most sinister character was put in the spotlight by Washington's bloody intervention against sovereign Grenada. There, a thousand miles from South Asia, the Reagan administration has given a visual demonstration of why the so-called Rapid Deployment Forces were created. The cutthroats from the units of these punitive forces were the ones who took part in the invasion of this tiny state in the Caribbean Sea, a state which had the courage to start to resolve its affairs without any prompting from Washington.

What is the connection between the tragedy of the people of Grenada and the security of South Asian countries, you might ask. Well there is a connection, for in exchange for weapons, Washington has managed to get from Islamabad the right to create its military bases and strong points on Pakistani territory. And they do not conceal in American headquarters that these bases are intended for the transfer and deployment of the very same Rapid Deployment Forces. Who can guarantee that, driven by imperial ambitions, the Washington rulers might not consider it possible in certain conditions to throw these forces against independent Asian states? There are no such guarantees, the more so since, owing to their independent policies, many countries in Asia have already been put on the United States' "black list".

'OBSTACLES' IN SOVIET-PAKISTANI RELATIONS VIEWED

LD302100 Moscow World Service in English 1531 GMT 30 Oct 83

[Text] Our Asian listeners note in their letters that the sole stumbling block in improving Soviet-Pakistani relations is the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan. All of them agree that the problem of Afghanistan must be resolved peacefully and on a just basis. Here is a commentary from Ivan Lavrov of our staff.

I share the hope of our listeners in Asia, he writes, for an early negotiated settlement of the international aspects of the Afghan problem. However, I cannot agree that the military assistance extended by the Soviet Union to Afghanistan at the moment of need is an obstacle to normal relations between the Soviet Union and Pakistan. The Soviet Union does not develop its relations with any other country to the detriment of third countries. This goes for Pakistan too. Now, what is the reason for the tense situation on the Afghan-Pakistani border? The true reason is not the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan; it's U.S. interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, which amounts to an undeclared war waged by the U.S. secret service from Pakistani territory. The escalation of that war prompted the Afghan Government to request the Soviet Union's assistance in repelling the outside threat and helping it defend the gains of the April Revolution.

The obstacles to normal relations between the neighboring countries in that part of Asia are caused by the intrigues of the imperialist circles. Part of responsibility for them also lies with the generals in Islamabad who maintain military cooperation with these circles. That cooperation is often justified by Pakistan's defense needs. But these claims are absolutely groundless. Pakistan is not threatened by anyone except its patrons who may involve the country in further dangerous adventures, as has been the case on many occasions in the past.

Soviet-Afghan relations are another confirmation of the fact that this country is a true friend of the nations that have cast off the yoke of colonialism and embarked on a path of independent development. Since the very first days of Soviet Government, this country has been following a policy of establishing relations of a new type with the Asian countries. These relations are based on equality, mutual respect, and noninterference in each other's affairs. The Soviet Union has helped Afghanistan to build 160 industrial facilities in key branches of the economy. Following the democratic revolution of 1978, cooperation between the two countries continued to develop. In that year, the two countries signed a treaty of friendship, good neighborliness, and cooperation.

While helping Afghanistan to repel outside aggression, the Soviet Union at the same time favors a political settlement of all problems in the region. Addressing the current session of the U.N. General Assembly, the Soviet ambassador, Troyanovskiy, said that the situation around Afghanistan can be settled on the basis of the proposals advanced by the government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, which the Soviet Union fully supports. There's no reason why Pakistan shouldn't respond to the Afghan proposals. The door is wide open.

And now, let us return to the issue of Soviet-Pakistani relations. In recent years, trade cooperation between the two countries has not been curtailed. The construction of the smelting plant in Karachi has gone on at a growing pace. Soviet experts will be taking part in the construction of a tractor plant in Lahore. Recently, the Pakistani minister of oil and natural resources, Rao Farman Ali Khan, visited Moscow. He signed a protocol providing for further joint prospecting for oil and gas and other mineral deposits in Pakistan.

The Soviet Union is prepared to expand cooperation with Pakistan further. The Soviet ambassador to Pakistan, Smirnov, reaffirmed this. Speaking in Islamabad, he said that there is considerable room for improving relations between the two countries. He said that normal development of these relations would benefit peace and seucrity in South Asia and throughout the world.

PRAVDA HAILS INDIA'S INTERNATIONAL ROLE

FM251646 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 83 First Edition pp 4-5

[Editorial: "India: Important Role in the System of International Relations"]

[Text] The charged correlation of forces in the world to the benefit of socialism and national liberation has resulted in a substantial growth in the role played in world politics by the countries that have liberated themselves of colonial or semicolonial dependence. Overcoming fierce resistance by imperialism, repulsing attacks by neocolonialism, and consolidating their political and economic independence, they no longer play -- just as V.I. Lenin foresaw -- the role of the object but the role of the subject of history.

A special position among the liberated states is occupied by India, whose policy exerts a noteworthy positive influence on the development of events in contemporary international life.

India is a country with a rich spiritual and material culture that has made an enormous contribution to the development of world civilization. It was only after gaining political independence, however, that it took the high road of independent development. Now we are fully justified in speaking of the outstanding role played by this great Asian power. In the modern system of international relations India emerges as a major influential force, which is the result of the interaction of a number of factors: its peace-loving foreign policy, its growing economic might, its important geopolitical location, and the considerable size of its territory and population. Today one in seven inhabitants of our planet is a citizen of India. Despite the complex problems inherited from the colonial past and the hardships connected with the country's vulnerability and caused by the pernicious effect of the world capitalist economy, during the years of independence, in other words since 1947, India has achieved highly tangible results in its development. Its gross domestic product has multiplied by a factor of 3.1 in total and 1.4 times in per capita terms; the total volume of industrial output has increased fivefold; and the output of factory and plant industry by 5.4. Agricultural output has multiplied by 2.1 times, with bread grain multiplying by 2.6 times.

The industrial base sectors have developed at increasing preferential rates. Steel output has increased from 1 million metric tons in 1950 to 10.7 million metric tons in 1982, mineral fertilizer output from 60,000 metric tons to 4.3 metric tons, and coal extraction from 32 million metric tons to 134 million metric tons. The oil-extraction and petroleum-refining industry has essentially been established anew. This course toward industrialization has enabled India to establish a multisectorial industrial complex. India's successes are significant in such high-technology sectors as electronics, nuclear power, and the aerospace industry. The country's scientific and technical potential is much increased: India has advanced to third position in the world in terms of the number of specialists with higher education.

India's foreign trade has been considerably diversified. Exports of the machine-building, chemical, and other modern sectors have increased. India is rendering economic assistance to 16 developing countries of Asia and Africa.

The establishment and development of the state sector have played a decisive role in accelerating India's economic growth. Substantial assistance in consolidating the country's economic potential is rendered by the Soviet Union, with whose economic and technical cooperation India has built, is building, and is planning more than 70 projects in key sectors of its economy. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi noted in one of her speeches: "We are thankful and grateful to the Soviet leaders for the fact that they offered us a helping hand in the decisive period of our development. Bhilai, Bokaro, and many other projects are evidence of this."

At the same time, India's development is taking place under conditions wherein the private sector, including monopolies, is growing and consolidating in parallel with the state sector. This fact, coupled with the Indian economy's ties with the world capitalist economy, generates hardships in the country's socioeconomic life. These hardships are intensified by the pressure exerted on India's economy by the imperialist multinational corporations.

India's emergence as an influential force on the international arena is inseparably linked with the foreign policy course followed by the country. The formulation of India's foreign policy and of the fundamental principles that guide it in world affairs has been most directly connected with the democratic traditions of that country's national liberation movement, headed by such outstanding figures as Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru. Adherence to the cause of peace, the struggle to ensure equality in both political and economic relations, implacability toward manifestations of neocolonialism, racism, and apartheid -- these are the fundamental principles of Indian foreign policy.

Following the acquisition of independence, India became one of the founders of the Nonaligned Movement, which today is an important factor on the international arena. From the moment of its emergence India has invariably played a positive and constructive role within it. India is a consistent champion of the implementation of the five principles of peaceful coexistence: mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, nonaggression, noninterference in one another's internal affairs, equality and mutual advantage, and peaceful coexistence.

Since the Seventh Conference of the Heads of State and Government of the Nonaligned Countries, held in Delhi in March 1983, India has headed this movement -- which today numbers about 100 states -- in its capacity of movement chairman.

The Delhi meeting took place in the complicated conditions of a sharply exacerbated international situation and interference by imperialist powers in the internal affairs of the nonaligned states and in their relations with one another, together with conflicts within the movement itself.

Utilizing its high prestige within the Nonaligned Movement, India, supported by the majority of nonaligned states, gave the conference's work an anti-imperialist and antimilitarist character, focusing its attention on the fundamental problems of world development, mainly the questions of eliminating the threat of a world thermonuclear war and ensuring universal peace and security for the peoples, as well as implementing the principles of the new international economic order.

The decisions taken at the Delhi conference demonstrated the aspiration of the movement's members for unity, their loyalty to the founding principles of struggle against war and aggression, against the arms race, and especially the nuclear arms race, and their understanding of the interdependence between disarmament and the further economic, political, and social development of the nonaligned countries.

India looks upon its policy of nonalignment as an active implementation of the positive principles of peaceful coexistence. J. Nehru described this policy as "positive, constructive, and purposeful."

Developing these principles, India's prime minister, Indira Gandhi, has pointed out that this policy "means, in the first place, that we do not belong to any military bloc at all and, second, that we reserve our right to form an independent judgment on any issue and take measures corresponding with our own interests and the interests of universal peace as we understand them."

In today's tense situation in the world India attaches exceptionally great significance to the struggle to end the arms race, for general disarmament, and to avert the threat of thermonuclear war. A special place within the system of India's foreign policy priorities is taken by the problems of peace and security in Asia and the question of transforming the Indian Ocean, whose basin is inhabited by the peoples of most Asian and African countries, into a zone of peace. The Soviet Union and India have expressed profound croncern with the situation in this region. In the Soviet-Indian joint declaration on the results of Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's September 1982 visit to the USSR they called for the liquidation of all foreign military bases existing in the Indian Ocean basin and condemned the growing foreign military presence in the region.

The positive thrust of India's foreign policy is also manifested by the fact that it stands on basically anti-imperialist, anticolonialist, and antiracist positions. India resolutely condemns Israel's expansionist actions against the Arab states, actions which are encouraged by the United States, and supports the Palestinian Arab people's struggle for the realization of their right to self-determination, right up to the establishment of their own national state. It opposes South Africa's aggression against Angola and supports the Namibian people in their struggle for independence.

The progressive public in all countries highly values India's approach toward the acute conflict situations arising in different parts of the world. Thus, the Indian Government's July 1980 recognition of the legitimate Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea not only proves the realistic assessment of the objective sociopolitical changes which have taken place in Indochina but also helps the process of normalizing the situation in the region. The Indian position on the question of the situation around Afghanistan, based on a sober analysis of the existing situation, is also aimed at the peaceful political settlement of the problem. India supports the Geneva talks between the Afghan and Pakistani foreign ministers through the personal representative of the UN secretary general. In 1983 the Indian Government submitted specific proposals for a settlement in the Near East and for ending the Iran-Iraq war.

Respect is generated by India's principled and, simultaneously, flexible policy regarding relations with neighboring countries. The process of normalizing these relations is, however, complicated by the interference of outside forces, mainly U.S. imperialism, in the internal affairs of the region's states. A decisive role in the implementation of U.S. military-strategic plans in Southwest and South Asia has been assigned to Pakistan. Washington is pursuing a policy of that country's large-scale militarization, which threatens India directly, as well as other states. The fanning of anti-Indian feelings in Pakistan has now been elevated to the status of state policy. It is in the context of U.S. and Pakistani anti-Indian policy that one should view the recent visit to that country by U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger and his talks with Ziaul Haq, the head of the military regime. The deterioration of the situation in South Asia is also linked with U.S. imperialism's intrigues in Sri Lanka, which cause natural concern in India and especially in view of the just-concluded Colombo visit by the very same C. Weinberger who, as the Indian newspaper NATIONAL HERALD remarked, has completed a "circular tour" around India with intentions that are unfriendly toward it.

The Soviet people highly value the considered approach the Indian leadership invariably shows in mutual relations with neighboring states and its persistent efforts for the political solution of the acute situations emerging in South Asia.

India is an active champion of reorganizing international economic relations on a just and democratic basis, of establishing the new economic order, and of putting an end to the exploitation of liberated countries by the developed capitalist states.

It is natural that India's independent and dynamic foreign policy would generate dissatisfaction and opposition by imperialism, and primarily U.S. imperialism. This was particularly sharply manifested during U.S. President Reagan's speech at the 38th UN General Assembly session, in which, according to the Indian newspaper TIMES OF INDIA, he "launched unjustified attacks against the Nonaligned Movement," whose chairman is India. Replying to similar statements in the past about the "tilt" toward the USSR tolerated by India, I. Gandhi said: "The point is not that we are with the Soviet Union but that the Soviet Union is with the countries of Asia and Africa and is supporting the independence movement and the struggle against colonialism."

India's relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are a component of its foreign policy. Soviet-Indian relations have become an important factor of peace and stability in Asia and all over the world. The friendship and all-round cooperation between our countries have withstood the test of time. India and the USSR share common positions on such major international problems of our time as ensuring peace, liquidating the threat of the outbreak of war, curbing the arms race -- and primarily the nuclear arms race -- adhering to the principles of peaceful coexistence, and taking practical steps to liquidate existing and prevent the emergence of new armed conflicts.

The message from the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the USSR Council of Ministers sent to the Indian leaders on the 36th anniversary of India's independence emphasizes: "The Soviet Union values highly its good relations with India and is in favor of strengthening friendship with it. These relations are built on the fruitful foundation of the Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation, correspond with the fundamental interests of the peoples of both countries, and serve the cause of strengthening peace and stability in Asia and the whole world."

India's adherence to the lofty and noble ideals of peace and the people's security is the firm foundation of its foreign policy. "Our appeal for peace," Indira Gandhi declared at the 38th UN General Assembly session, "is dictated not only by our good intentions but also by the fact that peace is vitally necessary insofar as the existing military machine threatens all mankind with destruction. Without peace today there will be no life tomorrow...As more and more people in all countries begin to understand where the accumulation of the monstrous stockpiles of nuclear death is leading, the movement for peace expands and grows beyond the framework of political ideologies. We can remain alive only if we pool our efforts in the struggle for peace."

India's foreign policy and its anti-imperialist, anticolonialist, and peace-loving course have augmented the country's prestige on the international arena; they help the further growth of its role in international affairs, which meets the interests of peace and progress in Asia and throughout the world.

SRV'S NGUYEN CO THACH ON USSR PEACE INITIATIVES

FM281701 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with SRV Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach by own correspondent B. Vinogradov under the "IZVESTIYA Interview"rubric: "The Course of Peace and Cooperation"]

[Text] Comrade Nguyen Co Thach, candidate member of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Politburo and SRV foreign minister, was recently in Moscow. IZVESTIYA correspondent B. Vinogradov asked him to express his opinion on a number of topical questions of international politics.

Question: How have the USSR's peace initiatives formulated in Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's recent statement and the USSR's proposals at the 38th UN General session been assessed in Vietnam?

Answer: It is difficult to overestimate the exceptional importance of the Soviet Union's new initiatives for the sake of peace and the security of the earth's peoples. And it is no accident that these proposals aimed at averting the threat of nuclear war, relaxing international tension, reducing armaments, and achieving disarmament on the basis of the principles of equality and identical security are meeting with such a broad positive response in the hearts of all people of good will.

At the same time, the stance of Washington, which, ignoring the peoples' will, is increasing the arms race and attempting to achieve nuclear superiority and to conduct talks with the Soviet Union from a "position of strength," is causing anger and indignation among peace-loving forces.

America's "big stick" policy aimed at establishing its global domination, diktat, and enrichment at other peoples' expense is well known to the world. The two world wars caused enormous destruction and cost millions of lives. The losses of the peoples of the European continent were considerable. The Americans alone grew rich during those two wars. The Soviet people, who made the greatest contribution to the struggle against fascism, made the greatest sacrifices in order to save mankind. But imagine what sort of world we would have today if the United States were allowed to have superiority in nuclear arms.

In the complex contemporary international situation, where the Reagan administration is attempting in every possible way to push mankind to the brink of a destructive nuclear war, the Soviet Union's peace initiatives and, in particular, Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's recent statement and the proposals set forth by the USSR at the 38th UN General Assembly session express yet again the essence of the Soviet state's principled peace-loving foreign policy. They show that the Soviet Union is making every effort to curb the arms race, avert the threat of nuclear war, and save mankind from destruction.

The Soviet Union's peace proposals fully meet the aspirations of all the peoples. They therefore enjoy the broad and resolute support of all mankind and everyone for whom life on the planet is precious. The great force of the Soviet Union's peace initiative has crossed state frontiers and has become the common weapon of all the peoples in the struggle to preserve peace and life on earth. The Vietnamese people, who bore the weight of a 30-year war and paid dearly for the right to be independent and live in peace, fully support these very important peace proposals.

Question: Our peoples will soon celebrate the fifth anniversary of the Soviet-Vietnamese Friendship and Cooperation Treaty. What role has this treaty played in further developing and strengthening Soviet-Vietnamese relations?

Answer: Yes, the Vietnamese and Soviet peoples will soon celebrate the fifth anniversary of the signing of the friendship and cooperation treaty between Vietnam and the Soviet Union. Friendship and cooperation between our peoples have good, long-standing traditions. The signing of the Vietnamese-Soviet Friendship and Cooperation Treaty opened a new page in the history of our two countries' relations. That important document was signed in a situation where the Vietnamese people, having freed and united their country, found themselves confronted with the large and extremely difficult tasks of healing the wounds they had suffered during years of protracted struggle. During imperialism's aggressive wars against our people twice as many bombs were dropped on Vietnam as were dropped on Western Europe during World War II. Our enemies planned to unleash a new war against the Vietnamese people, to wreck the plans for socialist building by means of an economic blockade, and thereby drain the country of its blood and bring it to its knees.

In this situation the friendship and cooperation treaty between Vietnam and the Soviet Union has played an exceptionally great role in strengthening the traditional friendly relations between our countries, and has been a very important factor in securing the Vietnamese people's victory in defending the country's independence and sovereignty. The Soviet Union's economic assistance and help to Vietnam on the basis of the treaty has been diverse and effective. This help is today expressed in major projects such as the (Hoa Binh) hydrosystem, the Pha Lai thermal electric power station, the (Thang Long) bridge, petroleum extracting enterprises, and many others. The Soviet Union is helping to develop the national economy and create in Vietnam the material base for building socialism.

The Vietnamese people's successes in the last 5 years are, of course, inseparable from the Soviet Union's help. The Vietnamese people consider the Soviet Union to be their most reliable friend and brother. During the difficult years the calamities of war, when Vietnam devoted all its efforts to gaining victory, and the period of postwar economic restoration the Soviet Union has always been alongside us, offering fraternal support in building and defending our homeland. The friendly relations and cooperation between Vietnam and the Soviet Union are a firm for peace and stability in Southeast Asia and further the maintenance of security throughout the continent, as well as in the Pacific region.

Question: The constructive initiatives aimed at normalizing the situation in Southeast Asia and transforming it into a zone of peace, good-neighborliness, and cooperation set forth by Vietnam, together with Laos and Kampuchea, have met with complete support in the Soviet Union. You, Comrade Minister, took part in the general debate at the 38th UN General Assembly session. How were these constructive initiatives received there?

Answer: Most countries in the world are gradually coming to realize that the resolutions of the United Nations and the UN international comference on the "Kampuchean question" are ineffective. The fact that a place is still kept for the Pol Pot clique in the United Nations is at variance with the aspirations of the Kampuchean people and the peoples of the world. This stance is deadlocking the problem and is not helping the strengthening of peace and stability in Southeast Asia. Even the ASEAN countries appreciate that it is impossible to cling for long to the uniform resolutions of the United Nations and the "UN International Conference on Kampuchea." All the delegations with which we had meetings and discussions consider that a more realistic approach to the prevailing situation in Southeast Asia must be formulated.

They believe that the only correct way to resolve the questions in Southeast Asia lies in dialogue based on respect for each other's legitimate interests, equality of rights, mutual benefit, and recognition of the need to examine any proposal by each side. Hence the countries of the world are becoming increasingly convinced of the judiciousness and logicality of the IndoChinese countries' peace initiatives.

## ALIYEV DELEGATION VISITS SRV, ATTENDS MEETINGS

### Met by Pham Van Dong

PM281719 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Oct 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Soviet Delegation in Hanoi"]

[Text] Hanoi, 27 Oct -- A USSR party-government delegation headed by G.A. Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, arrived here today on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee and the SRV Government. The delegation consists of N.I. Ryzhkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; V.V. Tereshkova, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Committee of Soviet Women; B.N. Chaplin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR ambassador to the SRV.

In Hanoi the delegation was met by Pham Van Dong, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers; Do Muoi, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and vice chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers; Vo Van Kiet, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and vice chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers; Nguyen Co Thach, candidate member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and SRV foreign minister; Nguyen Lam, secretary of the CPV Central Committee. SRV Ambassador to the USSR Dinh Nho Liem was also among the welcoming party.

Pham Van Dong and G.A. Aliyev exchanged brief greetings speeches during a meeting at the government residence.

### Le Duan, Aliyev Meet

LD281815 Moscow TASS in English 1557 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Hanoi October 28 TASS -- A meeting took place here today between a party-and-government delegation of the USSR, led by Geydar Aliyev, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, who are currently here on an official friendly visit, and Le Duan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV), Truong Chinh, member of the Political Bureau of the CPV Central Committee, president of the Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (SPV), and Pham Van Dong, member of the Political Bureau of the CPV Central Committee, Chairman of the SRV's Council of Ministers.

Geydar Aliyev conveyed fraternal greetings and good wishes to Le Duan and to the Political Bureau of the CPV Central Committee from Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the entire Soviet leadership. For his part, Le Duan asked to convey fraternal greetings and best wishes to Yuriy Andropov and other Soviet leaders.

During a conversation which passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere, Geydar Aliyev expressed deep satisfaction with the meeting with Le Duan and other Vietnamese comrades and with the hearty reception accorded to the Soviet party-and-government delegation in Vietnam.

The major importance of the meetings between Yuriy Andropov and Le Duan was emphasized on both sides. The meetings laid down a firm foundation for further successful development and strengthening of the fraternal friendship and cooperation between the USSR and the SRV in all fields.

A firm conviction was expressed that the official friendly visit by the party-and-government delegation to the SRV, their talks and meetings with the Vietnamese leadership, contacts with a large number of party and public activists, economic officials and the country's working people, and participation in the activities on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the treaty of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and the SRV will contribute to further strengthening and developing Soviet-Vietnamese relations and will help to coordinate still more closely the efforts in socialist and communist construction in the USSR and the SRV and in the joint struggle for peace and relaxation of international tension in the Asian Continent and in the whole world.

Key matters of Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation as well as topical problems of the present-day international situation were discussed. In this context the Vietnamese side expressed full support for Yuriy Andropov's statement dated September 28, this year, and for the conclusions and assessments contained in it.

The visit of the party and government delegation of the USSR to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam coincides with the fifth anniversary of the Vietnamese-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation, an historic document which signifies a milestone in the development of all-round cooperation between the two parties, states and peoples, Pham Van Dong said. He spoke at the reception in honour of the Soviet delegation held by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

The treaty means a new step in the development of friendship, cooperation and solidarity between the peoples of our two countries, Pham Van Dong said. The chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam stressed that the visit of the Soviet Party and Government delegation to Vietnam, the meetings and talks held in the spirit of complete community of views and mutual confidence are an imporant contrbution to the strengthening and development of fraternal relations between the two countries.

The Vietnamese people, Pham Van Dong went on, joyously express the feelings of boundless admiration for the Soviet people, the heroic fighter for great causes. The coming generations will remember forever the important historic contribution that the USSR made to the revolutionary cause of the peoples of the world, to mankind's destinies.

U.S. imperialism, acting in collusion with the reactionary forces, is now speeding up the arms race, creates a threat of nuclear war, openly interferes in internal affairs of a number of countries, flouts brazenly the sovereignty of nations, Pham Van Dong said. The latest evidence of this is the United States' overt criminal aggression against Grenada. All this aggravates international tension. The Soviet Union, because of its great strength, correct foreign policy, lofty responsibility to mankind manifests itself ever clearer as a staunch and persistent fighter for universal peace, for the destinies of mankind and life of all people.

We support resolutely the important statement that Yuriy Andropov made on September 28 of this year, in which the militaristic course of the Reagan administration is condemned resolutely and it is pointed at the same time that under any circumstances the Soviet Union will be able to ensure its own security, the security of its friends and allies.

Together with the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is waging persistent struggle to turn South East Asia into a zone of peace and stability, said the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. For this purpose Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea are exerting every effort to continue a dialogue with ASEAN countries. Remaining constantly on guard against the hostile designs of the ruling circles of China which act in collusion with U.S. imperialism, the Vietnamese people is waging a resolute struggle against their policy of expansion and hegemonism. At the same time in the spirit of respect for traditional friendship between the Vietnamese and Chinese peoples, in the interests of peace in Asia and all over the world the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is prepared to hold talks with the PRC with the aim of normalisation of relations between the two countries on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence.

We, Soviet people, are deeply satisfied over the fact that through decades we have been acting hand in hand with the fraternal Vietnamese people, solving jointly the tasks of socialist and communist constrcution, upholding peace and security of peoples, Geydar Aliyev said in his reply speech.

These days, Geydar Aliyev went on to say, the peoples of our countries are widely marking the fifth anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between the USSR and the SRV. It is pleasant to us to mark this jubilee here, on Vietnamese soil, among close friends. The past years have shown an immense vital power of the treaty which reliably serves the interests of our two countries, and the interests of socialism and peace.

The coordination of our activities in the world arena is a major sphere of cooperation between the USSR and the SRV. These activities acquire particular topicality in the present-day international situation which has been strained to a dangerous limit. The U.S. course towards spiralling up the arms race and towards further sharpening political cooperation is the main cause of the persistent tension. Washington broadens its military presence in various parts of the globe and creates springboards for interference in the internal affairs of states which disagree with its policy. Vast regions which are situated far from U.S. territory are declared at Washington's own whim to be spheres of U.S. "strategic interests". That adventurist, aggressive policy is hypocritically camouflaged by high-sounding talk of moral values, humaneness, etc.

Is there a limit to the hypocrisy of the U.S. leaders who under the cover of high-flown phrases about humanity and virtues at the same time send soldiers to kill innocent people of Lebanon, encourage genocide in El Salvador, conduct a war through mercenaries against Nicaragua, and are committing a brazen aggression against sovereign Grenada? Geydar Aliyev queried. The true meaning of Washington's demagogical discourses is also well known in Vietnam, the people of which quite recently experienced the horrors of U.S. intervention that took a toll of millions of lives of Vietnamese people.

As a result of the irresponsible policy of the present Washington administration, tension has sharply grown in many parts of the world -- in Europe, in the Middle East, in Central America, and in the south of Africa.

A principled assessment of that militarist course is contained in the September 28 statement of Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The true goals of that course -- and the leaders of the White House themselves do not conceal that -- are to try, without reckoning with the interests of other countries and peoples, to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union and other Warsaw-Treaty countries and to try to ensure dominant positions in the world for the United States.

The goodwill of our country, its sincere striving to do everything to avert nuclear danger from Europe are shown by Yuriy Andropov's answers to questions of the newspaper PRAVDA published on October 27, Geydar Aliyev went on. The proposals of the Soviet Union contain everything necessary for the achievement of mutally acceptable agreement which would not infringe on anybody's interests.

South East Asia remains an area of heightened tension. The imperialist circles and their accomplices continue in South East Asia the interference in internal affairs of states, hamper the establishment of a dialogue among countries of the region.

Our approach to the problem of seats of tension and conflicts existing in the world is well known. We proceed from the view that outside interference in internal affairs of states, threat of military force or its use are impermissible, from the insistent need to liquidate conflicts by peaceful means through mutually-acceptable solutions. We continue believing that there are no such problems in South East Asia which could not be solved through talks.

The Central Committee of our Party and the Soviet Government, Geydar Aliyev said, wholly solidarise with the efforts aimed at normalisation of the situation in South East Asia which are taken by Socialist Vietnam jointly with the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea. We are firmly convinced that turning South East Asia into a zone of lasting peace, goodneighbourliness and cooperation would meet the interests of all peoples and states of the region, broad interests of security over the entire of Asia and the whole world. We regard the course of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam directed at the achievement of this goal as constructive and just and fully support it.

## 'Warm, Friendly' Talks

PM282006 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Friendly Meeting"]

[Text] Hanoi, 28 Oct -- The USSR party and government delegation headed by G.A. Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, here on an official friendly visit, had a meeting today with Le Duan, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee; Truong Chinh, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the SRV State Council; and Pham Van Dong, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers.

G.A. Aliyev conveyed to Le Duan and the CPV Central Committee Politburo fraternal greetings and good wishes from Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the entire Soviet leadership. For his part Le Duan asked that fraternal greetings and best wishes be conveyed to Yu.V. Andropov and the Soviet leaders.

During the talks, which were held in a warm and friendly atmosphere, G.A. Aliyev voiced profound satisfaction with the meeting with Le Duan and other Vietnamese comrades and with the cordial, heartfelt welcome given the Soviet party and government delegation in Vietnam.

Both sides emphasized the very great significance of the meetings between Comrades Yu.V. Andropov and Le Duan, which laid a sound basis for the futher successful development and strengthening of fraternal friendship and cooperation between the USSR and the SRV in all spheres.

Firm confidence was expressed that the USSR party and government delegation's official friendly visit to the SRV, its talks and meetings with the Vietnamese leadership, its contacts with the broad party, economic, and public aktiv and the country's working people, and its participation in measures devoted to the fifth anniversary of the friendship and cooperation treaty between the USSR and the SRV will contribute to the further strengthening and development of Soviet-Vietnamese relations and will help to coordinate efforts still more closely in socialist and communist building in the USSR and the SRV and in the joint struggle for peace and the relaxation of international tension on the Asian Continent and throughout the world.

Central questions of Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation and also urgent problems of the present-day international situation were discussed. In this context the Vietnamese side voiced full support for Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's statement of 28 September this year and the conclusions and assessments contained in it.

Participating in the talks were: on the Soviet side -- N.I. Ryzhkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; V.V. Tereshkova, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Soviet Women's Committee; and B.N. Chaplin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR ambassador to the SRV; on the Vietnamese side -- To Huu, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and vice chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers; Do Muoi, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and vice chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers; and Nguyen Co Thach, candidate member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and SRV foreign minister.

The CPV Central Committee and the SRV Government held a reception in honor of the Soviet party and government delegation. The reception was attended by Le Duan, Truong Chinh, Pham Van Dong, and other leading Vietnamese figures.

Greetings the Soviet guests, Pham Van Dong emphasized that the delegation's visit coincides with the fifth anniversary of the Vietnamese-Soviet Friendship and Cooperation Treaty -- a historic document which is a landmark in the development of all-around cooperation between the two parties, states, and peoples.

The treaty, he said, marked a new step in the development of friendship, cooperation, and combat solidarity between our two countries' peoples. Guided by the spirit and letter of the treaty, the Communist Party, the government, and the people of the Soviet Union have given and are giving the Vietnamese people active support and tremendous valuable and effective assistance in building and defending the socialist motherland. Relations between Vietnam and the Soviet Union in various spheres and the cooperation between our parties and states in the international arena are daily becoming increasingly close in the interests of our countries, the socialist community, and the cause of peace in Asia and throughout the world.

The chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers emphasized that the USSR party and government delegation's visit to Vietnam and the meetings and talks, being held in a spirit of full unanimity and mutual trust, are an important contribution to the strengthening and development of fraternal relations between the two countries. He expressed very profound feelings of love and the very sincere gratitude of the CPC, the SRV Government, and the people of Vietnam to the Communist Party, government, and people of the Soviet Union.

The Vietnamese people, Pham Van Dong continued, joyfully express feelings of boundless admiration for the Soviet people -- a heroic fighter for great causes. Future generations will remember forever the important historic contribution that the USSR made to the revolutionary cause of the planet's peoples and to mankind's destiny.

American imperialism, acting in collusion with reactionary forces, is currently whipping up the arms race, creating a threat of nuclear war, openly interfering in the internal affairs of a number of countries, and roughly trampling upon the peoples' sovereignty. The overt criminal U.S. aggression against Grenada is the latest evidence of this. All this is complicating and exacerbating international tension. By virtue of its tremendous might, correct foreign policy, and high responsibility before mankind the Soviet Union is increasingly clearly showing itself to be a staunch and persistent fighter in defense of world peace and for mankind's destiny and the life of all people.

We resolutely support Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's important statement of 28 September this year, which resolutely condemns the Reagan administration's militarist policy and at the same time points out that the Soviet Union will be able to ensure its own country's security and the security of its friends and allies.

Together with the Lao People's Democratic Republic [LPDR] and the PRK, the SRV is struggling persistently to turn Southeast Asia into a zone of peace and stability. To this end Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea are making every effort to continue the dialogue with the ASEAN countries. Displaying constant vigilance in the face of the hostile intentions of China's ruling circles, which are acting in collusion with U.S. imperialism, the Vietnamese people are resolutely struggling against their policy of expansion and hegemony. At the same time, in the spirit of respect for the traditional friendship between the Vietnamese and Chinese peoples and in the interests of peace in Asia and throughout the world the SRV is ready to hold talks with the PRC with a view to normalizing relations between the two countries on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence.

G.A. Aliyev delivered a speech in reply. On the delegation's behalf he expressed deep gratitude for the kind words spoken about the CPSU and the USSR and wholehearted thanks for the cordial reception accorded to the Soviet guests and for the truly fraternal feelings for the Soviet people which the delegation has been sensing from literally the very first minutes of its stay on Vietnamese territory.

It is with great joy, he said, that I fulfill an honorable duty -- to convey to you, dear Vietnamese comrades, and through you to all SRV communists and working people, cordial greetings and good wishes from our party Central Committee, the Soviet Government, and personally from Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

We Soviet people are deeply satisfied by the fact that for many decades we have been acting hand in hand with the fraternal Vietnamese people, solving together the tasks of socialist and communist building and defending peace and the peoples' security. The regular meetings between our countries' leading party and state figures, primarily the meetings between Comrade Yu.V. Andropov and Le Duan give a powerful boost to the development of Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation in all spheres.

New evidence of this is provided by our delegation's visit and the Soviet-Vietnamese talks that started today. As always, they are taking place in a spirit of real comradeship and mutual understanding. The talks reaffirm the complete unity of our views and evaluations on all questions of Soviet-Vietnamese relations and the international situation and demonstrate the desire of both sides to continue to multiply the links and strengthen the friendship between our parties and countries on the most durable and tested basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism. This is the compass by which the CPSU and the CPV have always checked and continue to check their course, and the correctness of their line is convincingly confirmed by life.

Currently our countries' peoples are widely celebrating the fifth anniversary of the treaty of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and the SRV. We are happy to be here, in the land of Vietnam and among close friends, for this jubilee.

The years that have passed have demonstrated the tremendous vital force of the treaty, which reliably serves the interests of both our countries, the interests of socialism and peace. One cannot imagine Vietnam today without the plants and factories, the hospitals and scientific laboratories, or the state farms and plantations that have been or are being constructed by the joint labor of Vietnamese and Soviet workers, engineers, and specialists. For the Soviet and Vietnamese working people these are not simply industrial, agricultural, or cultural projects, for us this is the tangible embodiment of the fraternal friendship and comradely cooperation between our peoples and countries. I want to emphasize that the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Government will, for their part, continue to do everything so that Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation strengthens and develops in all directions.

The most important sphere of USSR-SRV cooperation is the coordination of our activities on the world arena. It is becoming especially topical in the present international situation, which has been heated up to a dangerous level. The main cause of the continuing tension is the course of speeding up the arms race and further exacerbating the political confrontation which is being followed by the United States. Washington is expanding its military presence in different parts of the world and creating bridgeheads for interference in the internal affairs of states disagreeing with its policy. The United States is declaring, according to its own whim, enormous regions far from its own territory to be spheres of its "strategic interests."

This adventurous and aggressive policy is hypocritically camouflaged by bombastic deliberations about moral values, humanism, and so on. Is there a limit to the hypocrisy of the U.S. leaders who, hiding behind pompous phrases about humanitarianism and virtues, are at the same time sending soldiers to kill totally innocent inhabitants of Lebanon, encouraging genocide in El Salvador, guiding the hands of mercenaries in the war against Nicaragua, and carrying out brazen aggression against sovereign Grenada? The true meaning of Washington's demagogic deliberations is well known also in Vietnam, whose people quite recently experienced the terrors of U.S. intervention, which cost the lives of millions of Vietnamese.

As a result of the incumbent Washington administration's irresponsible policy, tension has increased sharply in many of the world's regions -- Europe, the Near East, Central America, and southern Africa.

A principled evaluation of this militarist course is contained in the 28 September 1983 statement by Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The true goals pursued by this course -- and even the White House leaders themselves make no secret of this -- are, disregarding the interests of other countries and peoples, to attempt to gain military superiority over the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries and to attempt to ensure dominant positions in the world for the United States.

At this time our parties and countries, just like the entire socialist community and all peace-loving forces on the planet, have no more important task than to defend peace and prevent war.

Socialist Vietnam is making a worthy contribution to the accomplishment of this task and to the struggle against imperialism and hegemonism.

We highly appreciate the fact that the principled course of the CPSU and the Soviet state of strengthening peace and the security of peoples on the planet, curbing the arms race, and averting a nuclear catastrophe, the constructive initiatives advanced by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, and the joint proposals by the Warsaw Pact organization member states contained in the Prague political declaration and the Moscow meeting statement encounter the complete understanding and active support of the CPV and the SRV.

Our country's good will and its sincere desire to do everything to divert the nuclear peril from Europe are borne out by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's answers to PRAVDA's questions published 27 October. The Soviet Unions' proposals contain everything for reaching a mutually acceptable accord which would encroach on no one's interests.

Southeast Asia also remains a region of heightened tension. Imperialist circles and their accomplices are not ceasing their interference in states' internal affairs here and are hindering the setting up of dialogue between the countries in this region.

Our approach toward the problem of the seats of tension and conflicts in the world is known. We proceed from the premise of the inadmissibility of outside interference in states' internal affairs and threats and the use of armed force, and from the urgent need to eliminate with conflicts by peaceful means through the quest for mutually acceptable solutions. We remain convinced that there are no problems in Southeast Asia which could not be resolved through negotiations.

Our Party's Central Committee and the Soviet Government are wholly in solidarity with the efforts to normalize the situation in Southeast Asia which are being made by Socialist Vietnam in conjunction with the LPDR and the PRK. We are firmly convinced that the transformation of this region into a zone of lasting peace, good-neighborliness, and cooperation would accord with the interests of security throughout Asia and the world as a whole. We believe the SRV course aimed at attaining this goal to be constructive and fair and we fully support it.

The Soviet people are working persistently to implement the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and CPSU Central Committee November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums. Considerable successes have been achieved in implementing economic and social development plans and the people's prosperity is rising.

Soviet people have deep respect for the selfless labor of the fraternal Vietnamese people, who are confidently resolving the tasks set by the fifth CPV congress. We know what difficulties you are having to overcome, but we also know the unbending will the Vietnamese people possess and the boundlessness of their love for their motherland as it proceeds along a socialist path.

We believe the Vietnamese people under the leadership of their tested vanguard -- the CPV -- and its Central Committee headed by Comrade Le Duan will successfully surmount all difficulties and build their motherland as that great son of Vietnam and great friend of the Soviet Union, President Ho Chi Minh dreamed of seeing it.

You may be sure, dear Vietnamese friends, that our party and country have been, are, and will be with the Vietnamese communists and the Vietnamese people and that we will continue steadily to strengthen our common asset -- the great friendship of our parties, countries, and peoples.

The speeches of Pham Van Dong and G.A. Aliyev were listened to attentively and frequently interrupted by applause.

YEPISHEV RECEIVES LAOS ARMY DELEGATION

PM261445 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Oct 83 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Visit From Lao Friends"]

[Text] A delegation of political workers of the Lao People's Armed Forces headed by Colonel (Sitkhon Mavvola), member of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee and deputy chief of the Lao Armed Forces Main Political Directorate, was in the Soviet Union 13 through 24 October at the invitation of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

At the offices of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate and North Caucasus Military District Political Directorate our Lao friends were acquainted with the political organs' work to fulfill the decisions of the 26th Party Congress, the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums, and of the Sixth All-Army Conference of Primary Party Organization Secretaries to improve ideological work in the Army and the Navy, and with the experience of party political work in the USSR Armed Forces. The delegation visited several military training institutions and military units.

The Lao political workers were received by Army General A.A. Yepishev, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. Taking part in the conversation, which was held in a warm and friendly climate, were Lieutenant General V.P. Utkin, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, and other senior political workers.

The guests visited the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum, the "Study and Apartment of V.I. Lenin in the Kremlin" museum, and sites of revolutionary, labor, and combat glory in Moscow, Rostov-na-Donu, and Volgograd.

## LEBANESE PRESIDENT LEAVES FOR GENEVA TALKS

LD292142 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 29 Oct 83

[Text] Beirut October 29 TASS -- President Amin al-Jumayyil of Lebanon left for Geneva today to take part in a conference on national reconciliation in Lebanon opening there early next week. According to press reports, Walid Junblatt, Sulayman Franjiyah and Rashid Karami, leaders of the country's National Salvation Front, as well as N. Birri, leader of the Shi'ite movement Amal, have already arrived there. Representatives of Saudi Arabia and Syria are expected to attend the conference as observers.

It is noted in political circles that the conference is being convened at a time when the United States is pushing towards consolidation of its presence in Lebanon. This has been unequivocally confirmed by President Ronald Reagan who, appearing on television, said that Washington is not going to change its policy with regard to that Arab state. U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger had stressed earlier that the United States did not intend to withdraw its troops from Lebanon.

## U.S. POLICY, REINFORCEMENTS TO LEBANON SCORED

### 'Reagan's Aggressive Plans'

LD310458 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 30 Oct 83

[Text] The Reagan administration has announced the adoption of decisive measures in response to the blowing up of the main headquarters of the U.S. intervention forces on Lebanese soil. White House officials indicate that despite the event, the United States' role in Lebanon remains as before, and the presence of a U.S. contingent of troops in the country will be maintained. Moreover, Washington has dispatched fresh reinforcement toward the shores of Lebanon in the form of 10 or so warships with Marine detachments on board. They have been given the order to destroy the enemy at the approaches to the capital's airport. The combat operation will be supported by the guns of the battleship "New Jersey" and the artillery of other warships, and also by aircraft and helicopters based on the aircraft carrier "Eisenhower".

The United States has not sent a naval fleet to the shores of Lebanon for the sake of establishing peace and calm in the country, but exclusively in order to expand and strengthen its military presence in the Near East. There can be no doubt that U.S. soldiers have become victims in defense of the United States' political, economic and military interests in the Arab region, implementing Reagan's aggressive plans to turn Lebanon into a U.S. bridgehead in the Near East.

A public opinion poll recently conducted by the White House showed American's deep concern at the United States' role in Lebanon. Nevertheless, the White House is continuing expansion of its adventuristic actions there. As the Palestinian news agency WAFA reports, the blood of U.S. citizens is on the conscience of the White House, which is stubbornly adhering to a solution of Near East problems by force.

### 'Slander' Against Soviets

LD281949 Moscow in Arabic to Arab World 1500 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Weekly talk by Aleksandr Timoshkin, Moscow radio commentator]

[Excerpt] President Reagan yesterday spoke on American television claiming: If the forces of the United States and its NATO allies left Lebanon, then the Middle East will join the Soviet Bloc.

In other words, Reagan is trying to convince the Americans and the whole world that the United States, through its vicious armed intervention in the affairs of Lebanon and other Arab countries, is protecting the Arabs against Soviet danger.

If we go by this logic of Reagan's then we fall into the illogical. The present head of the White House is speaking about Soviet danger to the Middle East, but allow us to ask: Are Soviet naval fleets the ones laying siege to the shores of Lebanon and pointing their guns at the Libyan Jamahiriyah? Is the Soviet Union the one carrying out provocative exercises with the Rapid Deployment Force on Arab soil, building military bases there, and seeking to obtain military privileges? One might also ask other questions. Is it not American weapons and armament that has killed and is killing thousands of Lebanese and Palestinians? Is it not the United States which is financing the program of annexing Palestinian and Syrian territory occupied through the June aggression of 1967? Finally, is it not the United States which uses at the UN Security Council the veto against any draft resolution condemning Israel's aggression against the Arabs and the bloody crimes of the Zionists and their racialist anti-human pander against the Arab nation policy and practices?

Yet the U.S. President, in his television address, again produced no evidence or any semblance of evidence to verify his slander against the Soviet Union and its policy in the Middle East. The head of the White House is (?unable to do so), as has always been the case.

U.S. POLICY 'ATTEMPTS TO DIVIDE ARABS'

LD282359 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 28 Oct 83

[From the "Window on the Arab World" program by Aleksey Zlatorunskiy]

[Text] A few days ago Kenneth Dam an official of the U.S. State Department spoke. He summarized the principles of U.S. policy vis-a-vis the so-called moderate regimes, that is those Arab countries which, if not following a pro-U.S. foreign policy, at least do not oppose U.S. imperialist schemes. Kenneth Dam said that Washington will offer these countries military and economic aid so that they can struggle against other Arab countries, which are working firmly to remove the effects of the Israeli aggression and against the U.S. interference in Middle East affairs. He stressed that the strategic alliance with Israel was still the basis of U.S. policy In the Middle East.

Kenneth Dam's statements are not new. However, one has to draw attention to the severity of the conditions of the U.S. provision of aid; the political conditions which were expounded by one of the State Department officials. In other words there is an attempt to divide the Arabs into two distinctly different and conflicting camps, each one confronting the other, even regarding matters such as the resolution of the Palestinian issue and the removal of the effects of the Israeli aggression. In simpler terms, Dam's plan is nothing but a new attempt by the United States to form a group drawn from the Arabs which is hostile to the Arabs, and of course led by Washington and Tel Aviv.

U.S. PRESENCE IN INDIAN OCEAN, PERSIAN GULF HIT

PM261651 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Oct 83 First Edition p 3

[A. Golts "Military-Political Commentary: Warming Their Hands"]

[Text] THE BOSTON GLOBE has reported that the U.S. Administration is discussing the question of transferring several F-15 fighters to the Persian Gulf.

Previously a detachment of American warships had been sent to the gulf's shores, including the amphibious assault ship "Tarawa," with 2,000 American Marines on board. Several Harrier jump jets are also based on this ship. A U.S. Navy squadron led by the aircraft carrier "Ranger" is already in the Indian Ocean.

So here we have another outburst of U.S. militarist activity in the region. The possible exacerbation of military actions between Iran and Iraq served as the reason behind it. According to official Washington sources, THE BOSTON GLOBE notes, the administration is reckoning on a long-term U.S. naval presence in the region until "the situation clarifies."

Indeed, if the Iran-Iraq conflict did not exist, Washington, going by its militarist policy, might have invented it! Already observers have repeatedly noted that each deterioration of the situation on the Iran-Iraq front is an excuse for the United States to increase its military activity in the region. Hostilities between Iran and Iraq have been going on for 3 years. Most countries not only favor the ending of this tragic and senseless conflict, but are making practical efforts to that end.

Washington takes a different approach. American politicians saw in this tragic conflict the possibility of reaping military-political dividends and substantiating an unprecedented buildup of their armed forces in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean region. This war gives the Washington strategists the opportunity to expatiate about the instability of a region which, in their opinion, is "a sphere of U.S. vital interests."

Yet there has been a major U.S. naval group comprising one or two aircraft carriers in the Indian Ocean since 1979. The region's "instability" is the U.S. Administration's justification for creating the so-called Central Command, aimed against 19 countries of Southwest Asia and the Near and Middle East.

Moreover, Washington is not only warming its hands on the flames of the Iran-Iraq conflict but is also studiously throwing logs onto the fire. The Washington administration's intention to send an air force subunit and a detachment of warships into the region "for a lengthy period" convincingly demonstrates that Washington reckons on continuing to exploit the Iran-Iraq conflict in its own militarist interests.

## MUSLIM DELEGATION ENDS VISIT TO KUWAIT

LD282321 Moscow TASS in English 1751 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Moscow October 28 TASS -- "A delegation of Soviet Moslems that just returned from a trip to Kuwait had been given a warm, fraternal reception in that country," Mufti al-Hajd Makhmud Gekkiev, chairman of the Moslem board of the northern Caucasus, told a TASS correspondent. "We were glad that we were united by words of the holy Koran that people created by the Allah almighty must know well and respect each other."

During our stay in Kuwait we had a great number of interesting meetings and conversations with Islamic theologicians, with representatives of state power, teachers and students of higher educational establishments, believers in mosques. We told our brothers about the life of the Soviet people, including Moslems, the mufti said.

The mufti said that the problem of peace and security of peoples held an important place in the conversations. We saw that many people in Kuwait are concerned over the threat of nuclear catastrophe, which is looming larger because of the intentions of the U.S. Administration to deploy new lethal missiles in West European countries.

The mufti said that people with whom the members of the delegation talked had been well informed of the stand of the Soviet state on those problems and had highly assessed the peace proposals that were advanced by the head of the Soviet State Yuriy Andropov.

"The delegation of the Soviet Moslems," the religious leader said, "got convinced that Israel's aggression against the Arab peoples of Palestine and Lebanon, which has become possible due to the backing by the U.S. Administration, is resolutely condemned in Kuwait."

"The United States' latest abominable action against Grenada was condemned in Kuwait. We were unanimous with our brothers in the assessment of that barbarous attack of a large power on a small country. This could not have been otherwise, for that aggression is a glaring violation of international law which must protect every country in the world".

I take this opportunity to thank the leaders of the Kuwaiti state and all those who accorded hospitality to us, Mufti al-Hadj Makhmud Gekkiev said in conclusion. On behalf of the Soviet Moslems I wish success and flourishing to them and the entire Kuwaiti people, he said.

We shall return home in a few days and we shall be telling believers about everything that we saw during our trip. We shall convey greetings and blessings to Moslems in our country from their brothers in faith in Kuwait, the mufti said.

## EGYPTIAN PROGRESSIVE UNIONIST PARTY CC MEETS

LD282354 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 28 Oct 83

[From the "Window on the Arab World" program by Aleksey Zlatoninskiy]

[Text] A meeting of the Central Committee of the National Progressive Unionist Party began in Cairo on the 27 October. The party secretary general, Khalid Muhi ad-Din presented a report entitled, "For Realistic Changes in the Process of (?Establishing) Democracy." Khalid Muhi ad-Din said that certain positive changes have taken place in Egypt after As-Sadat's era ended. He specified some of the successes achieved by the national forces in the struggle against parasite groups which have been exploiting the backing of their imperialist protectors and the Zionists, and hindering by all means any essential change in Egypt. Khalid Muhi ad-Din said that the parasitic capitalist policy is aimed at regenerating Egypt's dependence on the United States and international monopolies. He pointed out the dangerous consequences of Camp David, which, he said, paved the way for the establishment of the strategic alliance between the United States, Egypt, and Israel in order to stand in the path of national and social liberation forces in the Arab world and Africa. Khalid Muhi ad-Din expressed his doubts about the possibility of working successfully for Egypt's return to the policy of nonalignment and to the bosoms of Arabism under the shadow on the Camp David accords. He said that this return was not congruent with carrying out joint exercises with the U.S. Army and granting it military facilities.

GRENADA EXEMPLIFIES U.S. POLICY OF 'AGGRESSION'

PM281157 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Oct 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Valentin Falin "Political Observer's Opinion': "Washington is Trampling on Law and Morality"]

[Text] A crime has been comitted. The people of Grenada are its victims. The imperialist juggernaut has brought its military might to bear and crushed a tiny sovereign state. It had the audacity to live according to its own views and pinned its hopes for its own secure imdependent existence not on weapons but on good-neighborliness, UN membership, and the norms of international law. Free Grenada is no more. There is one more territory occupied by the United States, one more reservation where American Marines are acting every role at once in a nasty show that used to be called a gunboat and big stick policy and is now passed off as a "program of democracy."

R. Reagan and his associates are ex post facto inventing public exlanations for Washington's insolent, unprovoked aggression. They abound in words about "freedom," "threats" to American citizens, and U.S. fulfillment of its "responsibilities" to the Caribbean. All lies and nonsense have been mobilized, and they are quite indistinguishable from the insinuations which accompanied the American intervention in Guatemala and the Dominican Republic, the attack on Cuba, and the American special services' conspiracies in Chile and other countries in South and Central America and from the malicious fabrications now being used as cover for the violence in El Salvador, the lawlessness in Honduras, and the terror and preparation of a massive invasion against Nicaragua.

Lies do not cease to be lies because the flags of Jamaica, Barbados, St Lucia, St Vincent, and Antigua have been raised over the interventionist army alongside the Stars and Stripes. Perhaps an aggressor feels more comfortable in the company of accomplices in crime. Perhaps the disgrace which Washington has brought upon itself seems less because it is shared by others. In fact, the involvement of small dependent countries in adventures merely emphasizes the depth of the degradation of the political leadership of the mightiest imperialist power, for which all means are good for the sake of achieving its mercenary aims and which is motivated by imperial megalomania and an obsession with world supremacy.

The decision to mount an armed attack on a UN member state was made in the middle of last week, when R. Reagan was celebrating his 1,000th day in power. At a press conference called to mark the jubilee the President dilated on the "new course" which he has mapped out for the United States and on the "long and difficult process of breaking with the past." The head of the American Administration defended and extolled the "secret operations" being conducted against Nicaragua and other countries with the CIA's participation. He even maintained that such operations "form part of the administration's responsibilities" and that the United States "has the right to undertake secret activity if this best serves its interests." Never before has a hymn to state terrorism, subversion, and blackmail been sung with such striking candor and such blatant disdain for human morality and the laws of international society.

On the eve of the invasion of Grenada R. Reagan evaded at the time a direct reply to a question about whether his administration would drag the United States into many wars, overthrowing governments at its own discretion and setting up Washington's lackeys in their place. He got away with arguments about "missionary work" and "idea" R. Reagan has in mind, what kind of "democracy" he means, what kind of carte blanche he advocates for the United States, and what he is preparing for others

Political observers in the West frequently try to find in the U.S. Administration's actions some rational kernel, some glimmer of common sense. They still think that the troglodytic view of reality on the eve of the 21st century cannot be the limit R. Reagan's world outlook. They want to believe that the horizons of someone on whose actions mankind's continued existence largely depends extend beyond rounds of golf and crusades. It seems that they are seeking the philosophers' stone, which does not exist. The "new course" is banditry sanctified by power, and the "break with the past" is the elevation of gross, shameless disdain for the principles of international relations to the status of a rule and the turning of the tyranny of the strong into a norm.

Even before taking up the post of president, R. Reagan dreamed of the time when his enemies would go to sleep every night in fear lest the United States use nuclear weapons against them. One thousand days and an equal number of nights have passed since he has been lording it in the White House, and the head of the American Administration is probably satisfied. Through his efforts peace has become less reliable, and the danger of war is growing.

Grim facts convince the peoples every day that Reagan means the arms race, the flouting of existing treaties and agreements, and interference in others' affairs. Reagan means the revival of American imperialism's hegemonist plans in the version most dangerous to all mankind. Following the attack on Grenada, it has become still more obvious to everyone that Reagan's policy is one of aggression and war.

## U.S. 'BANDITRY' 'VANDALISM' IN GRENADA ASSAILED

PM281158 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Oct 83 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Korionov "Political Observer's Notes": "You Cannot Escape Responsibility for Banditry"]

[Text] Reports are being received from all corners of the earth of angry protests against the new crime committed by the Washington administration in Grenada. A completely unprovoked, blatant act of aggression has been committed against a state which is a full member of the United Nations. It is a cynical and hegemonist claim to the perpetration of arbitrary and lawless acts in the international arena. "State terrorism" is increasingly overtly becoming the norm of the current U.S. ruling bosses' policy.

Washington is desperately trying to find "arguments" enabling it to somehow justify the vandalism it has carried out. President Reagan set the tone when he declared that the armed vasion of Grenada was undertaken with a view to...protecting "innocent lives" and establishing "order and democracy" on the island. At the same time U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz was brought onto the stage.

Speaking at a press conference, Shultz also reiterated that in taking the decision to intervene, Reagan was allegedly guided by "concern for the well-being of American citizens living in Grenada." The secretary of state assured people that allegedly an "atmosphere of violence and and uncertainty" prevailed in Grenada. This allegation was so transparent that Shultz himself admitted that "it is not possible to be certain" of the accuracy of the reports on which Washington based its actions. The absurdity of the "argument" the administration is using is obvious just from the fact that an official State Department spokesman, speaking a few days before Shultz, admitted publicly: "The situation in that country is calm on the whole. No harm has been done to U.S. citizens in Grenada." It is also known that a few days ago the Grenadian Government allowed American diplomats from the U.S. Embassy in Barbados to come to the island to find out the position of American citizens there. Finally, the President himself said, in his 25 October statement: "Our citizens are safe."

We know from history that imperialist colonizers have made very frequent use of the assertion that it is necessary to "protect" their citizens to justify their bandit "gunboat diplomacy." The White House could think of nothing more original than to resort to this same old hackneyed method.

The second "argument" which, according to Shultz, guided the White House incumbent in issuing the order to intervene, is not notable for veracity either. It boils down to this: Washington apparently received a "request" from certain Caribbean governments to "establish law and order" in Grenada. But who can be deceived by this "argument"? The whole world knows that the regimes we are talking of are completely dependent on Washington and do its bidding. This is merely the screen which Yankee imperialism is using to achieve its aims.

In addition we may ask: Since when has an appeal by one or several states to another state for intervention against a sovereign country been "grounds" for armed aggression? What about international law and the UN Charter and principles in these circumstances?

The U.S. secretary of state's assertions only confirm that Washington has arrogated to itself the "right" to determine what system other countries should have and what policy they should pursue. But what is this if not imperial insolence?

Under the hail of questions, the leader of the U.S. foreign policy department wriggled around like a snake. He was asked whether the U.S. actions were not a violation of the OAS Charter? In fact, Article 15 of this document, which bears the U.S. signature, is: "No state or group of states has the right -- on any pretext -- to interfere directly or indirectly in the internal or external affairs of any state. The aforementioned principle applies not just to armed interference but also to any other form of interference or tendency whose aim is to encroach on the person of the state or its political, economic, and cultural organs." Shultz tried to maintain that the OAS Charter does not extend to the Caribbean region.

Shultz was reminded of his statement in the past about Lebanon: "The right of a small country to decide independently how to achieve its sovereign aims without outside pressure, threats, or blackmail is at risk." In reply, the secretary of state began to dilate incomprehensibly about the fact that there was supposedly a "vacuum of governmental responsibility" in Grenada. But it is clear to everybody that such assertions serve only to justify armed interference in the affairs of other countries. What is more, Shultz even declared that regimes in the Caribbean region which are dependent on Washington are to "form a temporary government" in Grenada. After all this, what value has Washington politicians' big talk about the "rights of states," "human rights," and so forth?

At the end of the conference Shultz started to give assurances that the American forces would leave Grenada "as soon as this is possible." But let us remember that when the American Marines landed in Lebanon, the White House declared that this would be a limited contingent and that it would stay only for a month. The "month" has now turned into 18 months, and the number of American soldiers who are in effect occupying Lebanon is growing all the time.

Washington's clumsy attempts to justify the crime against the Grenadian people is evidence that the White House's policy remains one of international banditry concealed behind deception, hypocrisy, and cynicism. And no attempts and subterfuges by Washington to justify such actions will achieve this aim.

The Reagan administration is setting itself against all mankind by its impudent flouting of all the norms and principles of the international community. Its isolation in the world arena is growing. This is the natural consequence of its policy of banditry.

CUBAN STATEMENTS, COMMENTS ON GRENADA NOTED

PM281247 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Oct 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Statement by the Cuban Communist Party and Government"]

[Text] Havana, 27 Oct -- A statement by the Cuban Communist Party [PCC] and Revolutionary Government on the U.S. imperialist intervention in Grenada has been published here. It says in particular:

The sad events in Grenada that resulted in the death of Prime Minister M. Bishop and other Grenadian leaders are known to all. The Cuban Government reported them in detail and formulated our country's principled and honest position regarding these events. At the same time, it warned that imperialism would try to derive maximum benefit from the tragedy that had taken place.

Special emphasis was placed on Cuba's determined policy of not interfering in any way in the internal affairs of Grenada's party and people.

Following Bishop's death and Cuba's statement in connection with it, our party's relations with the new Grenadian leadership became very cool and to some extent strained. Nevertheless, we did not intend in any way to play into imperialism's hands and push Grenada's people into calamity or break off cooperation with that country or the work by our construction workers, doctors, teachers, and other specialists.

Future relations with the new leadership would have been determined by the behavior of the new leaders and their domestic and foreign policy.

On 22 October, when the danger of U.S. invasion became inevitable, F. Castro, first secretary of the PCC Central Committee and chairman of the republic's State Council and Council of Ministers, sent a message to Cuba's representatives in Grenada, which said:

I consider that the immediate evacuation of our personnel at a time when U.S. Naval ships are approaching the island could have a demoralizing effect and would be an unworthy action by our country in the eyes of the world public. A large-scale U.S. aggression against us could begin at any moment -- in Grenada against our construction workers, in Nicaragua against our doctors, teachers, technical personnel, construction workers, and others, in Angola against our military and civilian personnel, and maybe even against Cuba itself. We must be always prepared for this and maintain high morale.

I believe that under the new circumstances that have developed we must step up defense, bearing in mind any sudden attack. If the United States does carry out an intervention, our duty would be to defend ourselves resolutely, as if we were in Cuba, in our own camps and work places, but only in the event of being subjected to direct attack.

Cuba's representatives in Grenada were instructed to make the following oral announcement to the Grenadian leaders:

The political situation inside Grenada in connection with the split among the people following the death of Bishop and other leaders considerably diminishes its defense capabilities, this being the consequence of grave mistakes committed by the Grenadian revolutionaries. In this light, the present military and political conditions are the worst possible for organizing resolute and efficient resistance against the interventionists, which would be practically impossible without the people's participation. It is necessary to give some thought to how to achieve reconciliation of the circumstances surrounding Bishop's death and the extent of each one's responsibility for this.

The Grenadian Government could attempt to eliminate the pretext for intervention by giving and publicly reaffirming its full guarantee of the safety of U.S., British, and other citizens and its cooperation in their evacuation.

If, despite all this, an invasion does occur, its duty is to fight to the end, no matter how hard and unfavorable the conditions may be.

Cuban personnel have been instructed to remain in their camps and carry on work on the airport construction. They will take steps to ensure their defense and strengthen, to the extent that this may be possible, the region where they are located so as to prepare for sudden attack.

Two subsequent messages -- on 23 and 24 October -- informed the Grenadian leadership that, if a large-scale U.S. invasion did occur, the Cuban personnel would defend their positions in the region where they are located. The Cuban personnel have neither the forces or facilities to accomplish any other tasks nor the moral and international justification, under the present circumstances, for such actions beyond the region of their work.

A message was sent to the U.S. Government on the eve of the aggression, that said: The U.S. side is aware of the events which have occurred in Grenada. It is also aware of our position regarding these events and of our intention not to interfere in this country's internal affairs. We, for our part, are aware that the United States is concerned about the fate of numerous U.S. citizens in Grenada. We are also concerned about the fate of hundreds of Cubans working in various sectors in that country, as well as the reports that U.S. naval subunits are approaching Grenada.

According to information available to us, not a single U.S. or other foreign citizen has had any problems, and this is also true of our personnel. It would be expedient for our countries to maintain contact and cooperate, in the event of difficulties arising, by taking steps for the safety of those people and in order to avoid violence and intervention.

The U.S. Government's reply to this message was received almost 3 days later, by which time U.S. troops had been attacking Cuban personnel for over 90 minutes and troops had been landing for more than 3 hours.

The construction workers and other Cuban citizens, who had practically no time to entrench and erect any fortification facilities in the rocky locality, offered resolute and heroic resistance to the aggressor.

In the evening of 25 October the department representing U.S. interests in Cuba was handed a statement which pointed out that Cuba had done everything possible to avoid intervention, that not a single U.S. citizen nor a single foreigner had been subjected to any danger, and that the intervention is absolutely unjustified.

It reported that the Cuban personnel had suffered losses, with their members being either killed or wounded in the fighting, and that the attack by the U.S.troops was sudden, without any advance warning whatsoever. Although the Cuban personnel who are still capable of resisting are in a disadvantageous position in terms of numbers and in terms of military and technical equipment, the statement went on to say, their morale is high and they are full of determination to continue to defend themselves if the attacks continue.

In order to really avoid further bloodshed, the statement went on to emphasize, the attacks against Cuban and Grenadian personnel must stop. An end must be put to a battle which in no way does honor to the United States. This battle is being waged against small forces which, from the military point of view, cannot oppose the overwhelming superiority of the U.S. forces. Nevertheless, by losing the battle and sacrificing themselves, they are capable of inflicting a costly moral defeat on the United States which is involved in a war against one of the smallest states on our planet.

The U.S. Government has been informed that the leader of Cuban personnel on Grenada has been instructed to receive any parliamentarian who may address him, hear his proposals, and convey them to Cuba.

During the evening hours of 25 October the construction workers and other Cuban personnel were still in possession of numerous strongholds while fighting an unequal and hard struggle, displaying high morale and firmness. As night fell, only a few reports came out of Grenada and communications with that country became difficult.

The courageous and heroic construction workers and other Cuban citizens have written an unforgettable page in the annals of the cause of international solidarity. Eternal glory to the Cubans who have fallen in battle and to all those who fought and continue to fight in defense of their principles, international duty, and motherland which is threatened by an illegal, brazen, and criminal imperialist aggression.

## U.S. 'Allegations' Denied

LD291004 Moscow TASS in English 0719 GMT 29 Oct 83

[Text] Havana October 29 TASS -- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Cuba has circulated Friday another emergency report of the Revolutionary Government of Cuba. It exposes gross falsehood and allegations of the U.S. Government concerning the developments in Grenada.

According to the Pentagon, over 1,000 Cubans allegedly stayed in Grenada before the aggression, and half of them later took part in battles. In reality, their number, including diplomats, women and children, never exceeded 800.

The document points out that by today, nothing is known about the fate of 61 Cubans. The report exposes cynical allegations of the U.S. President and representatives of his administration to the effect that a military base was allegedly being built in Grenada and that large stores of Cuban weapons intended for other revolutionary movements were found there.

Even deceptions of Hitlerite fascists look a mere trifle in comparision with unheard-of fabrications of the U.S. ruling circles, who are going out of their way to justify their criminal actions. Some of their representatives went to the length of asserting that silos for strategic missiles were allegedly being built in Grenada.

The developments in Grenada demonstrate the aggressive nature of the policy pursued by the incumbent U.S. Administration, the document underlines.

Castro Statements Cited

LD301104 Moscow TASS in English 1056 GMT 30 Oct 83

[Text] Havana October 30 TASS -- The Revolutionary Government of Cuba issued a report here about yesterday's telephone conversations between Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Council of Ministers of Cuba, and Colombian President Belisario Betancur and Felipe Gonzalez, chairman of the Spanish Government.

Fidel Castro was briefed on the position of the Washington leaders, with who Belisario Betancur had conducted talks, concerning the evacuation of Cuban citizens from Grenada.

Fidel Castro emphasised that the U.S. authorities should first of all specify how many Cubans had been killed, how many of them had been wounded, how many had been taken prisoner and what their position now was. Expressing serious concern about the destiny of his compatriots, he charged that the U.S. side was giving mendacious data about the numerical strength of the Cuban personnel in Grenada and delaying their evacuation.

The Cuban leader gave to Betancur and Gonzalez data concerning the contingent of Cuba citizens in Grenada by the start of the aggression and briefed them on other questions that are being grossly and arrogantly distorted by the U.S. side.

Cuba's legitimate concern, the report said, was met with understanding by the Government of Colombia and Spain which have assumed mediatory functions.

U.S. STATEMENTS ON GRENADA INVASION QUESTIONED

LD290034 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1755 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] Washington, 29 Oct (TASS) -- The American authorities are trying to represent the armed invasion of Grenada as an operation by the administration to "save their countrymen,' and are trumpeting about its success. To confirm this version, they are trotting out statements by those why have "rescued" the very same people who, just a few days ago, were saying they were in no way threatened, but then, after the appropriate "talks," began to claim that they had been in some sort of danger. Thus, one more time Washington is using the of-used reference to "the protection of American citizens" in order to introduce its occupation forces into a sovereign country and to overthrow the system there.

Attention is called to the position of the administration with regard to the period of stay on Grenada of forces sent there supposedly "to save Americans." Representatives are more and more frequently now talking not about days but weeks and even months, moreover, tying up the withdrawal of forces not only with the completion of the evacuation of American citizens, but also with the creation of "a stable democratic government," modeled on America. Measures are being taken to create such a system of power that will facilitate the strengthening of American influence. At the head of the government, the United States is planning to place the former governor general of Grenada, who maintains close contact with American authorities.

As with the preparation for the invasion, those behind the maneuvers are surrounded by mystery, reservations, secrecy. American journalists have not succeeded in getting an answer from Weinberger, the defense secretary, to the question on the concrete participation of certain Caribbean states in the operation to carry out the intervention. They were not allowed in on the military actions. As is noted in the press, they are being used as a fig leaf in order to hide the largest post-Vietnam adventure of U.S. interventionist action, carried out from the beginning to the end exclusively by American forces of intervention.

SCOON SEEN AS U.S. 'FRONT MAN' IN GRENADA

LD311052 Moscow TASS in English 1013 GMT 31 Oct 83

[Text] New York October 31 TASS -- The local journalistic circles point out the strange conduct of Paul Scoon, the former British governor-general of Grenada, who is acting in such a way as if it is not the Buckingham Palace, but the White House which once appointed him to that post.

Indeed, at the height of the U.S. intervention against that island state, a false report was circulated that the invasion had been launched at Scoon's "request". But the lie was soon exposed, as both the Buckingham Palace and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher officially declared that no such request had been addressed to them. This made the American propaganda media to start shifting and dodging, to picture things as if Scoon's request had been sent to Washington allegedly "through east Caribbean representatives." The question why the information had been sent to Washington and not to London has remained unanswered.

At the present time, Scoon, who is closely patrorized by the Americans and is acting apparently to their instructions, is ever more boldly appearing as a dummy master of Grenada. He ordered a curfew and urged the Grenadians, who are continuing resistance to the occupiers, to lay down their arms; is talking of a "transitional period" and forming a "provisional government." All of his "initiatives" are sanctioned, to be more precise, forced, by the same Washington. London, which hints to its American partners that it is inappropriate to treat it so unceremoniously, so far remains aloof.

Scoon's strange behaviour is not so much surprising. Washington has used him and continues using him as a frontman to cover both the aggression and the "new order" established by the occupiers in Grenada.

SCHERBITSKIY 21 OCTOBER KHARKOV ADDRESS

AU281919 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 22 Oct 83 pp 1-2

[RATAU report on speech by V.V. Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukranian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, at the 21 October ceremony of presenting the October Revolution Order to Kharkov]

[Text] Esteemed comrades: Today Kharkov is receiving the October Revolution Order awarded to it for the valor and staunchness displayed by the working people of the city during the Great Patriotic War, and for the successes attained in economic and cultural construction.

Allow me on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers to cordially congratulate you, all inhabitants of Kharkov, and participants of the battle for Kharkov, on the high fatherland's award and on the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the city from the fascist oppressors.

Dear comrades: During the discussion on the award to your city, Yu.V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, made a warm remark about the inhabitants of Kharkov and highly assessed your part in the cause of communist construction. Yuriy Vladimirovich has conveyed heartfelt greetings and best wishes to the inhabitants of Kharkov.

Receive also, dear comrades, warm congratulations from the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committe, Supreme Soviet Presiduum, and government.

The working people of Kharkov, Comrade V.V. Shcherbitskiy continued, have filled quite a few brilliant pages in the chronicle of the revolutionary struggle waged by the country's workers class, and of building socialism and communism. V.I. Lenin classified the 1900 Kharkov May Day meeting as an outstanding event attesting to the class maturity of the proletariat and to its readiness for the political struggle against autocracy and capitalism.

Having enthusiastically welcomed the victory of the October armed uprising in Petrograd, proletarian Kharkov became a strong point in the struggle for instituting Soviet rule in the Ukraine. The first All-Ukrainian Congress of the Soviets, held in the city on 25 December 1917, proclaimed the Ukraine a republic of the soviets of workers, soldiers, and peasants' deputies.

The entire country heard the words of the message addressed by the Ukraine's first soviet government to the RSFSR Government "The blood shed by the Ukrainian and Russian workers and peasants in the name of the workers revolution in the Ukraine has sanctified forever the fraternal alliance between the labor masses of Great Russia and the Ukraine."

The Seventh All-Ukrainian Congress of the Soviets was held in Kharkov 7 years later. It adopted the decision on the state union of the Ukrainian people with the Russian and other fraternal peoples in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This decision expressed the inflexible will of the labor masses and has become one of the cornerstones for the power and strength of our union state.

Having translated into reality the dreams of all our country's peoples about social and national liberation, the Great October also opened for Kharkov a path to an impetuous flight. The achievements attained by the city under Soviet rule have clearly demonstrated the inexhaustible possibilities of the socialist order, and the enormous transforming power of the Communist Party's ideas and of friendship among the USSR peoples.

In the first 5-year periods, the city built a number of giant enterprises of Soviet industry. Many outstanding scientists and cultural figures were working in Kharkov shoulder to shoulder with the workers class to accomplish creative tasks that were unprecedented in their scope. The city has become a true forge of cadres for many national economic branches. All this determined the role of Kharkov in consolidating the country's economic and defense potential in the pre-war period.

When the fascist hordes invaded the land of the soviets, the city fully subordinated its life to the needs of the front. Nearly 300,000 inhabitants of Kharkov, including 105,000 communists and Komsomol members, joined the Red Army in the first months of the war. An authentic heroism was also displayed by the inhabitants of Kharkov during the evacuation of the city's industry to the East. With their selfless toil in the Altay and the Urals, in Siberia and Kazakhstan, the inhabitants of Kharkov helped forge the victory over the enemy.

At the bleak hour of the occupation, Kharkov did not succumb to the oppressors. The ground was burning under their feet. An underground party obkom, 9 raykoms, an oblast, and 4 rayon Komsomol committees, dozens of party and Komsomol organizations, 49 partisan units and subversive groups were operating in the city and oblast. More than 1,000 partisans and participants in the underground movement were awarded orders and medals for courage and heroism displayed in the struggle against the fascists. Five underground leaders -- I.I. Bakulin, underground obkom secretary; and Komsomol leaders A.G. Zubarev, A.M. Shcherbak, N.T. Volkova, and M.T. Kislyak -- were posthumously awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union.

As you know, Comrade V.V. Shcherbitskiy said, bloody battles were fought in the oblast against the enemy. At Taranovka village, Zmiyevskiy (presently Gotvaldovskiy) Rayon, the soldiers of Lieutenant P.N. Shironin's platoon parried attacks by the superior forces of the enemy for 5 days, without retreating. All 25 guards were awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union.

It is to be noted that at Sokolovo Village, in the same rayon, the first Czechoslovak battalion, commanded by Ludvik Svoboda, obtained its baptism by fire. In recognition of their valor and courage, 85 Czechoslovak soldiers were awarded USSR orders and medals, and Senior Lieutenant Otakar Jaros -- the title of Hero of the Soviet Union.

On 23 August 1943, our fatherland's capital city, Moscow, fired a salute in honor of the liberation of Kharkov by the troops of the Steppe Front commanded by I.S. Konev.

Participating in the battles for Kharkov Oblast were the sons and daughters of all Soviet peoples. The number of Heroes of the Soviet Union fallen in the defense and liberation of the city includes Ivan Bykov and Andrey Oshchepkov, Russians; Daniil Yeretik and Vladimir Yesaulenko, Ukrainians; Pavel Kazakevich, Belorussian; Enver Akhsarov, Ossetinian; Vladimir Kharaziya, Abkhazian; Khachatur Melikyan, Armenian; Veniyamin Sidorov, Udmurtian; and many others.

The inhabitants of Kharkov fought on the fronts of the Great Patriotic War against the enemy valiantly and heroically. About 250,000 inhabitants of the city and oblast were decorated with orders and medals. More than 250 of them were awarded the titles of Hero of the Soviet Union. Anatoliy Konstantinovich Nedbaylo and Zakhar Karpovich Slyusarenko were twice awarded this title.

Not all Kharkovites returned from the battlefields. Our people will cherish forever the feat performed by the patriots who offered the dearest thing -- their lives -- for the freedom and independence of our Soviet fatherland.

(With a minute of silence, the session participants paid tribute to the memory of those fallen).

Many people present in this hall, Comrade V.V. Shcherbitskiy pointed out, remember well how the fascists destroyed Kharkov in a barbarian way and ruined about 500 industrial enterprises. The entire country assisted the inhabitants of both Kharkov and other Ukrainian oblasts liberated from the oppressors. The city's industry in its rebirth turned into a project of truly nationwide importance. In the first postwar 5-year period, Kharkov industrial enterprises were fully reconstructed. They surpassed the pre-war level in basic indexes. This was a result of selfless heroic toil performed by the Kharkovites. These were the real fruits of the creative strength of socialism, of friendship, and mutual assistance among all the country's peoples.

Present at this ceremony, Comrade V.V. Shcherbitskiy continued, are many persons whom we respect as veterans. Well known in your city are the names of Aleksandra Vasilyevna Yesava, party member since 1914; Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Voskresenskiy, party member since 1919, and university professor; Socialist Labor Hero Varvara Ivanovna Chmil, labor veteran at the Kharkov tractor plant; Socialist Labor Hero Vasiliy Ivanovich Artoshenko, member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences; retired Major General Mikhail Dmitriyevich Borisov; retired Colonel and Hero of the Soviet Union Sergey Mikhaylovich Ostashenko; Socialist Labor Hero Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zaslavskiy, tool fitter at the electroengineering plant; Socialist Labor Hero Mariya Yakovlevna Paramonova, forewoman at the Malyshev plant; and of many others. They all are worthy representatives of the generation whose lot was to be pioneers in a difficult and at the same time very honorable mission. You have every reason to be proud, our dear veterans, and you have a great deal to pass into the reliable hands of the younger generation!

Our party highly values the veterans' services and endeavors to make maximum use of their experiences, knowledge, and deep party conviction for the benefit of the cause of communism. This was emphasized at the CPSU Central Committee meeting with party veterans by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman.

Allow me, Comrade V.V. Shcherbitskiy said, to express to you, esteemed party, war, and labor veterans, heartfelt gratitude for your combat and labor feat, and to wish you primarily good health, good luck, every kind of prosperity, and new successes in your noble work for the benefit of our beloved fatherland!

Having risen from the ruins, Kharkov has become even more beautiful. Its workers class, engineers, technicians, scientists, cultural workers, and all Kharkovites have multiplied their good deeds, the successes. It is sufficient to say that, compared with the pre-war year 1940, the volume of Kharkov industrial production has increased 15 times.

In 1970, in recognition of the great services rendered by the city inhabitants in economic construction, the city was awarded the Lenin Order. High state awards were conferred on 66 labor collectives in the city, including the Lenin Order on 17 of them.

Also appreciable is Kharkov's part of labor in the matters of both our republic and the entire country. Almost all turbines for nuclear power stations, more than 20 percent of generators and large electric machines, almost 35 percent of commercial air conditioners, and one-sixth of the bicycles made in the USSR now bear Kharokov trade-marks. Well known in our country and beyond its borders are the achievements of Kharkov innovators, designers, and scientists.

You are aware, Comrade V V. Shcherbitskiy said, what large-scale and complex tasks are confronting us in the current 5-year period in line with the decisions of the 26th party congress, of the November 1982 and the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenums.

As far as the economy is concerned, as Comrade Yu.V. Andropov emphasized, the point is that we have embarked upon a new stage in the country's economic development, a stage at which the increased possibilities and social needs are commanding the need to raise the standards of the entire economic work, to sufficiently improve economic effectiveness, and to turn our enormous economy into a well-tuned continuous-operation mechanism. The economic, social, and organizational measures taken by the party in this direction have met with full approval both in our republic and in the entire country.

The increased labor activity of people and the strengthened discipline and good organization have positively resulted in plan fulfillment and in growing production effectiveness. In the current year, the peace of economic development has substantially accelerated. In the 9 months, the republic marketed industrial production in excess of the plan worth R1.5 billion. The state of affairs in capital construction has improved. The pace of construction and assembly operations has accelerated.

In agriculture, conditions in the current year have been very unfavorable, particularly in southern and southeastern oblasts in which the basic areas of grain crops are concentrated. This has affected the gross output of grain. As far as other crops are concerned, the obtained yields of sugar beets, potatoes, and vegetables have been rather good. We have procured more hay and green grass than last year. The republic's stockbreeders have raised the productivity of cattle and poultry, and this made it possible to increase, compared with 1982, procurements of meat by 124,000 tons, those of milk by 1,179,000 tons, and those of eggs by 357 million units.

In Kharkov Oblast, the state of affairs has also improved. The value of industrial production marketed since the beginning of the current 5-year period in excess of the plan by Kharkov Oblast enterprises has reached a total of R302.5 million, including R224.6 million marketed by the city enterprises.

The June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum found that, in the economic sphere, it was highly important to radically raise labor productivity, and to reach the highest world standards in this important index. The 1983 plan for raising labor productivity is being fulfilled in Kharkov City and Oblast, as well as in the republic as a whole. This factor is accountable for the entire increase attained by the city in industrial production.

It is highly important to note that at this crucial sector of work the inhabitants of Kharkov have been laboring creatively, have been looking for and finding new reserves. As you know, the Ukrainian Community Party Central Committee has recently approved the initiative of front-ranking Kharkov enterprises to meet the 5-year targets for increasing the volumes of production without increasing labor and the basic kinds of material resources. What makes this initiative particularly valuable is the fact that it ties up in one single knot the struggle for raising labor discipline, improving management, and saving resources. Appreciable results have already been attained. Since the beginning of the 5-year period, Kharkov has saved about 70,000 tons of rolled ferrous stock, 26,000 tons of cement, 70,000 cubic meters of timber, and 433 million kilowatt-hours of electric current.

The Kharkov initiative -- "Let Us Meet 5-Year Targets Without Increasing Resources" -- has met with wise support all over the republic.

For an industrial city as large as Kharkov, it is vitally important to accelerate scientific-technical progress. This is the main foundation and condition for accelerating the rate of economic development, for raising economic efficiency, and thus for improving the people's prosperity. Since the beginning of the 5-year period, the city enterprises have comprehensively mechanized about 140 shops and sectors, and have put into operation more than 260 automatic and mechanized assembly lines. The scope of the application of robots and highly productive equipment has increased. All those measures have made it possible to save the labor of 15,000 workers. The tasks for accelerating scientific-technical progress are being accomplished in a businesslike and creative way at the Kharkov Tractor Plant, the Malyshev Plant, the Torgkholodmash, the Ukrelektromash, and the Kharkov Turbine Plant production associations, at the machine tool building, the electric equipment, and other plants.

Industrial Kharkov is also an important scientific center. It accommodates one out of every five of the republic's scientific institutions and employs one out of every seven scientists living in the Ukraine. Well known in the country are the achievements scored by the collectives of the following institutes: for Low Temperatures, for Machine-Building Problems, the Physico-Technical Institute, the All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Electric Machines, as well as the Polytechnical and Aviation Institutes, the State University, and others. Kharkov scientists are applying each year in the national economy more than 3,000 scientific papers which produce an annual effect exceeding R300 million.

The city's great scientific potential allows us to expect that Kharkov research workers will increase their part in accelerating scientific-technical progress in the national economy both of the republic and of the country as a whole.

It would be quite right to set the task: to turn Kharkov into an authentic laboratory for advanced experience in the field of accelerating scientific-technical progress. The workers class, engineers, technicians, designers, and scientists of Kharkov are up to such a task.

The inhabitants of Kharkov have been doing, can, and must do a great deal to accomplish the tasks stemming from the country's Energy Program. Kharkov turbine builders have developed economical and reliable steam turbines for nuclear power plants, and hydraulic turbines for high-pressure and flatland GESes.

Comrade V.V. Shcherbitskiy noted the need for further improving the technical characteristics of production at the heavy electric machinebuilding and the electroengineering plants, and at the transport and hoist equipment plant. The leaders and specialists of these enterprises must more rapidly overcome the inertia of obsolete ideas and habits, and must be more energetic in searching for new ways of improving the quality and of reducing material consumption in machine and equipment construction. The work performed in this field by party committees at the city enterprises must be more purposeful and exacting.

The city and oblast labor collectives, Comrade V.V. Shcherbitskiy said, bear great responsibility for multiplying their part in the implementation of the Food Program. It is precisely Kharkov which largely determines the development of machine building not only in the republic, but also in the country as a whole. Many models of highly productive agricultural equipment were developed in Kharkov in the last decade alone. These were primarily the energy-satiated [energonasyschennyye] T-150K tractors, and powerful diesel engines with turbine superchargers for tractors and combines. I cannot help reminding you that the farmers are impatiently waiting for the mass production of energy-satiated T-150 caterpillar tractors.

We must also see to it that the Hammer and Sickle Plant fully copes with the plan for increasing its capacities for the production of diesel engines for Don-1500 grain harvesting combines. The country is waiting for these combines. More attention is to be paid at the Hammer and Sickle and the tractor engine plants to the quality of diesel engines. Kharkov machine builders have all the conditions necessary to produce the world's best aggregates.

The inhabitants of Kharkov assist agricultural workers as mentors. In the current year, which was difficult weatherwise, the oblast has gathered an average of 17.3 quintals of grain -- excluding corn -- per hectare, and has fulfilled socialist pledges for the sales of grain to the state. Some 1,154,000 tons of grain have been delivered to state resources. The oblast has obtained rather good yields of sugar beets, vegetables, and other crops.

These achievements also contained a significant part which was contributed by city inhabitants. Mentors' assistance must also in the future be fostered, using for this purpose all reserves, and displaying initiative and interest.

A great deal has been done by Kharkov builders. They were those who have built in the postwar period, speaking figuratively, four cities as large as pre-war Kharkov. More than 30,000 apartments have been put into service since the beginning of the current 5-year period alone, and this enabled nearly 110,000 Kharkovites to improve their dwelling conditions. Kharkov has built 17 children's establishments, 5 schools, 4 hospitals, and 4 polyclinics.

In a word, Kharkov is growing and vigorously developing. We must join forces to make work and life in this city good.

Kharkov is renowned for many remarkable laborers. Well known both in the republic and all over the country are the names of Twice Socialist Labor Hero V.G. Sergeyev; Socialist Labor Heroes V.V. Biblik, general director of the Kharkov S. Ordzhonikidze Tractor Plant Production Association; V.A. Petrov, turner at the Malyshev Plant and CPSU member; N. Saulov, turner at the Turbine Plant; V.S. Plakhotin, builder and assembly worker; member of the USSR Academy of Medicinal Sciences L.T. Malaya; N.A. Shonin, chief designer at the Malyshev Plant; and many others. These are precisely the people -- selfless toilers who know and like their jobs, ardent patriots of out Soviet motherland -- who give every reason to believe that a new man is not only a remote ideal, but a reality of our times.

Our party regards the communist education of the Soviet people as one of the most important lines in improving a developed socialist society. The June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum emphasized that, under the present conditions, ideological work was increasingly moving to the foreground. The main point at present is to translate into practice the tasks set by the plenum, to make more effective use of the many means of education, training, and propaganda, and to apply them more vigorously and creatively.

The process of shaping a new man is as continous and complex as life itself. Our advance not only offers chances for the all-round development of personality, but also presents it with demands on the part of society. The party displays particular concern for the ideological education of the younger generation. We take legitimate pride in our industrious, inquisitive, and educated young people, and we entrust great things to the Leninist Komsomol. In the interests of our society, the new generations must profoundly apprehend Marxist-Leninist convictions, must assimilate and continue the traditions of the parents, and must develop into highly moral people, ardent patriots, and internationalists.

Under the conditions when the class adversary is waging a psychological war against us, we must intensify the class tempering of youths, must cultivate irreconcilability to bourgeois ideology, and the firm willingness to defend the conquests of socialism.

Our people are profoundly aware that the frenzied policy of anticommunism and international provocations, pursued by the present White House administration, the unprecedented line aimed at the arms race and confrontation, which is forced by the most aggressive U.S. and NATO circles, create a real threat to peace. This adventurist game played by the United States and their allies with first-strike nuclear weapons has aroused wrath and indignation among all the planet's peace-loving forces. This is why our people and all people of goodwill accorded such warm and unanimous support to Yu.V. Andropov's statement and to other proposals and actions by the Soviet state, aimed at frustrating the criminal intentions of warmongers.

In numerous publications, the progressive -- and not only progressive -- press points out that Yu.V. Andropov's proposals provide for a quest for mutually acceptable solutions on an honest and fair basis, for solutions that would not infringe upon anybody's legitimate interests. And all progressive forces, all sober-minded people on earth welcome such a firm and constructive stand taken by our state. As far as those swinging a nuclear truncheon are concerned, Comrade Yu.V. Andropov gave them an unambiguous answer: "The Soviet people can be confident -- our country's defense capacity is at such a level that nobody would be advised to arrange a trial of forces."

Let us agree, comrades: This was a firm and clear statement. We are not fatalists -- peace can and must be defended. The black forces of war must be defeated. But this calls for endurance and determination for new efforts.

The front of the struggle against imperialism is now running across the mind and heart of each Soviet man, across each working place. Each one at his place must do the utmost for peace. And must do it well, because the better we work, the richer will be our country, the stronger will be its economic and defense potential, the stronger will be its defense capacity, and the better and safer will be our lives. This truth is well known, but this does not make it obsolete. One can say without exaggeration: Our discipline and good organization, our selflessness in toil, our patriotism and consciousness are the struggle for peace. In the memorable years of the war, these precisely were the qualities of the Soviet people that guaranteed the victory for peace:

At the end Comrade V.V. Shcherbitskiy said:

The awarding of the October Revolution Order to Kharkov is a high appraisal for the organizational role played by the city party organization, which numbers about 140,000 communists. Kharkov's achievements in accomplishing socioeconomic and educational tasks are evidence that the city's communists are able to select crucial tasks and, concentrating the main forces on them, are able to succeed. This is also a result of due attention paid to the city by the obkom and the oblispolkom, as well as by the republic's and union organs.

Highly important is the experience accumulated by the city party organization in raising the vanguard role and the ideomoral example of communists. This experience is being generalized and analyzed in a businesslike, demanding manner at the present report and election party meetings and conferences.

With the increased requirements in mind, it is important to consistently continue the line aimed at strengthening party and state discipline, to improve the selection and distribution of cadres, to improve the style of work, and to strengthen, by all means, links with the masses.

The communists and all laborers of Kharkov, decorated with two orders, will undoubtedly achieve new heights in social and scientific-technical progress.

May the fatherland's new high award inspire you, esteemed comrades, and all inhabitants of Kharkov for new accomplishments to the glory of our great socialist motherland.

Comrade V.V. Shcherbitskiy read the decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and, to stormy applause, pinned the order on the city banner.

(Comrade V.V. Shcherbitskiy's speech was listened to with great attention and was repeatedly interrupted by prolonged applause.)

MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA CARRIES GRISHIN ADDRESSES

Veterans Council

PM271200 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Oct 83 pp 1, 2

[Unattributed report: "Veterans Council Session"]

[Text] A session of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Veterans Council was held yesterday at the Mosocw CPSU Gorkom.

The council session opened with an introductory speech by V.V. Grishin, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom.

R.F. Dementyeva and A.M. Roganov, secretaries of the Mosocow CPSU Gorkom, took part in the session.

Not much time has passed since the day of the meeting between party veterans and Comrade Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and party Central Committee secretaries at the CPSU Central Committee, V.V. Grishin said, opening the session.

The time since then has shown that this meeting was enormously significant, and it has exerted a beneficial influence upon improving the efficiency of the activity of party organizations and their ideological work. The work of party organizations and party raykoms with veterans has also been further developed in this time. Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's speech at the meeting with the party veterans determined the specific ways to utilize their experience and knowledge.

These questions were recently discussed at a meeting of the city party aktiv. Many of the participants in this session also took part in that meeting's work. The experience of party and labor veterans, V.V. Grishin stressed, assumes special significance at the present stage, when the party has set complicated and responsible tasks of substantially improving the economy's efficiency and the effectiveness of ideological work and comprehensively strengthening organization, responsibility, and conscientious discipline and order everywhere, both in production and in daily life.

The Moscow City party Organization today includes over 30,000 communists who have been party members for more than 50 years. Much can be done by the veterans. It was noted at the meeting at the CPSU Central Committee that realism and a considered approach in evaluating both successes and problems which await solution are characteristic of veterans. Party orgnizations enlist their help in resolving questions of party and public activity. For example, about 5,000 veterans now actively work in public councils and commissions under CPSU Raykoms and party committees with the rights of raykoms.

The range of problems with which the veterans deal is wide. They are making their contribution to improving the system of Marxist-Leninist education. Their experience and knowledge are invaluable in educating the growing generation. About 200,000 cadre production workers, many of them labor veterans, participate in the mentor movement and do much for the education of young people.

At the same time, however, it would be useful to galvanize even further and give a new meaning to the activity of the various veterans councils and commissions that exist under raykoms, party committees, and party bureaus and in labor collectives and public organizations. There are still many Muscovite pensioners who play no active part either in production or in public activity. Of course, not all veterans, for reasons of age or health, are capable of giving attention to public work. But even so, the importance of utilizing the experience of party and labor veterans in order to intensify party influence of residence is not taken fully into account everywhere. Veterans are insufficiently involved in the work of public economic councils, standing production conferences, commissions for the control of the administration's activity, organs of people's control, commissions to combat alcoholism and drunkenness, and public cadres sections. There remain unsolved questions in improving social, consumer, and medical services for party and labor veterans. They themselves can accomplish much in this respect.

The party gorkom is taking steps to fulfill the tasks raised by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov during his meeting with the party veterans. Work to utilize veterans' experience has been stepped up during the process of implementing the plan of measures approved by the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Bureau. The party raykoms have conducted meetings with party and labor veterans; they have elaborated and are implementing a whole range of appropriate measures. Specific steps are being taken by the Moscow City Trade Union Council and the City's Komsomol Committee. A Veterans Council has been set up under the gorkom by decision of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Bureau, among other measures aimed at fulfilling the tasks set by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov.

It includes the best representatives of the capital's older generations, people with rich experience of personal participation in resolving the most complicated tasks of communist building. Almost one-half of the council's members have more than 50 years of party membership. Leading workers, economic leaders, party workers, and Soviet Army veterans are represented on the council. It is envisaged that the Council's activity will be aimed mainly at elaboration proposals and recommendations for the fullest utilization of party and labor veterans' experience and knowledge in resolving the specific problems of the socioeconomic development of Moscow and its enterprises and organizations and of the communist education of working people, and of young people in particular.

It is to be supposed that one of the council's most important tasks will be to study, generalize, and disseminate the experience of veterans' work in rayon and primary party organizations, provide help, and coordinate the activity of veterans councils and commissions under party raykoms. The council must deal with the elaboration of proposals enabling veterans to create favorable conditions for continuing their labor and public activity and for their daily life and relaxation.

Party veterans' participation in the report and election campaign has markedly increased of late. Quite a few businesslike proposals have been submitted by veterans. Party committees and party bureaus are listening to their opinion. This is a positive development. Veterans' activeness in the life of party organizations must be comprehensively developed. The Veterans Council can help in this important work.

The study year in the political education system is now underway, V.V. Grishin went on to say. Here too, we see the increased role of party and labor veterans. Party raykoms and the party organizations are instructing them to deliver lectures at political instruction sessions and to take part in the work of young communists' schools. The veterans participate actively in the work of revolutionary history museums and labor glory museums at plants, factories, and transport enterprises.

The voice of Great Patriotic War and labor veterans rang out in last Saturday's 800,000-strong antiwar demonstration in Moscow in support of the peace-loving course followed by our party and state as expressed in the statement by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Together with all the capital's working people, the party veterans are preparing to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the movement for a communist attitude to labor and the 66th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The party gorkom sees the Veterans Council under the Moscow CPSU Gorkom as a militant and active assistant in resolving the tasks facing the city party organization. Naturally, the gorkom will give the council every assistance and cooperation.

The session then held elections for chairman of the Veterans Council under the Moscow CPSU Gorkom.

Hero of Socialist Labor Pavel Dmitriyevich Borodin, CPSU member since 1932, member of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet deputy, member of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, and former general director of the Avtozil Association, was elected chairman of the Veterans Council under the Moscow CPSU Gorkom at the proposal of the party gorkom bureau.

Deputy chairmen and a council secretary were also elected.

A plan for the council's work was approved at the session.

The floor was then given to members of the Veterans Council. In their speeches they expressed profound gratitude for the high trust and assured the Moscow CPSU Gorkom that they will make every effort to fulfill the tasks set by the party. We veterans, they said, can and must play our role in implementing the party's and the people's plans. Proposals and suggestions regarding the council's work were also expressed.

At the conclusion of the session V.V. Grishin expressed thanks to the members of the Veterans Council for their desire to apply all their energy to implementing the party's directives, expressed confidence that the council's work will be fruitful, and wished them health and successes.

## Moscow Party Conference

PM271122 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Oct 83 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Conference at Moscow CPSU Gorkom"]

[Excerpt] A conference of party raykom first secretaries and rayispolkom chairmen was held yesterday at the Moscow CPSU Gorkom.

Taking part in the conference were members and candidate members of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Bureau, party gorkom section chiefs, and deputy chairmen of Moscow Gorispolkom.

L.A. Borisov, secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, delivered a report on preparations for conducting the communist subbotnik on 15 October 1983.

Raykom First Secretaries P.Ye. Dikarev from Zhdanovskiy Rayon, V.S. Sablin from Moskvoretskiy Rayon, and F.F. Koloskov from Tushinskiy Rayon took part in discussing the question.

The conference was addressed by V.V. Grishin, first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom.

Anniversary Planning Session

PM271029 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 Oct 83 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Capital Prepares for National Holiday"]

[Excerpts] A session of the Moscow Gorkom Commission for the Planning and Celebration in Moscow of the 66th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution was held yesterday in the gorkom offices under the chairmanship of V.V. Grishin, first secretary of Moscow gorkom.

The session was addressed by V.V. Grishin, first secretary of Moscow gorkom.

SHEVARDNADZE CHAIRS CONSTRUCTION GROUP MEETING

PM261420 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 15 Oct 83 p 1

[GRUZINFORM report: "To Ensure that Construction Work Increases"]

[Text] In Kindgi, Makuzani, and Napareuli projects and capacities of prime state importance have been commissioned within the planned deadlines. So the panorama of construction progress in the republic highlights even more strongly the unfavorable state of affairs that has taken shape at the Sachkhere Cotton-Spinning Factory construction site: With the failure to solve the technical engineering problem of strengthening the joists of the main production building's roof that has arisen at the construction site, the installation of the technological equipment has been delayed here.

Having noted this at a session conducted by E.A. Shevardnadze, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, the working group for the construction and development of the republic's most important enterprises outlined a number of specific urgent measures. The implementation of these measures was entrusted personally to leaders of the republic's Construction Ministry and the Gruzglavmontazhspetsstroy. Increased demands have been made on the organizational work of the Sachkherskiy party raykom aimed at ensuring the commissioning of the cotton-spinning factory.

The commission demanded that the pace of the construction of a number of installations at the Tbilisi Electric Locomotive Construction Plant and the Kataisi Motor Vehicle Plant be increased, that a number of questions connected with the commission of capacities at Chiatura, the Kutaisi Motor Unit Plant, and the Kindgi Greenhouse Combine be resolved, and that commissioned facilities of the agro-industrial complex be fitted out with equipment.

Against the background of the overall dynamics of capital construction in the republic, progress can be singled out in the sphere of the construction of housing, vocational and technical schools, and social and cultural projects -- the 9-month plan for the commissioning of housing and other buildings has been fulfilled. Nonetheless, serious criticisms were made at the commission session regarding the quality of construction work.

Comrades G.V. Kolbin, G.A. Andronikashvili, and S.Ye. Khabeishvili addressed the working group's session.

Comrade E.A. Shevardnadze reviewed the sesion's results. Taking part in the session were S.P. Machin, chief of a CPSU Central Committee sector, and N.P. Galev, USSR deputy minister of the electrical equipment industry.

SUPREME SOVIET AWARDS LENIN ORDER TO USTINOV

LD291238 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 29 Oct 83

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has awarded the Order of Lenin to Marshal Dmitriy Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense. The higher order was conferred for his outstanding services to the Communist Party, the state and in connection with his 75th birthday.

WEATHER WORSENS AT SITE OF ARTIC SHIP RESCUE

LD202057 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 29 Oct 83

[Text] A report from Murmansk: The Arctic has shown its untrustworthy character today in the western sector, near Chelyuskin Cape, where four icebreakers together, the Sibir, Lenin, Kapitan Nikolayev, and [word indistinct] are conducting a larger group of ships westward. A strong west wind and sharp fall in temperature have created conditions recalling those which arose at the beginning of the month in the Long Strait. The transport ships are not capable of following without assistance the channels cut in the ice by the atomic icebreakers. They have to be tugged.

This morning Siberian hydrologists discovered from on board a helicopter a relatively well thinned-out ice field, 50 miles north of Chelyuskin Cape. The crews of the icebreakers have decided to lead the ship they are tugging to that place, and to try to cover that stretch of the route more quickly.

Last of 20 Vessels Rescued

LD310428 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 30 Oct 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] The headquarters for maritime operations in the eastern part of the Arctic today received a report from the Bering Strait. The last of 20 vessels, the tanker "Igrim," has been freed from the ice in the Chukchi Sea. The Arctic navigation season has not ended with its release from the ice. The Northern Sea route has seen the departure only of those vessels that have been unloaded and have been badly damaged. The remaining six transport vessels are preparing for a rush assault. It has been decided, despite the harsh weather condutions, to continue the delivery of vitally important goods to the towns and settlements of the extreme north.

MOSCOW REPORTS CHEMICAL FACTORY ACCIDENT

LD281502 Mosocw World Service in English 1230 GMT 28 Oct 83

[Text] A government commission is taking measures to clean up the Dnestr River, following an accident at a chemical factory during which a dam burst and noxious wastes were discharged into the river. The local population was warned in time, and there were no casualties. But the river, which was considered to cleanest in the European part of the country, suffered. Criminal proceedings were started against eight officials at the factory responsible for the accident.